



---

THE  
SCRIPTURE MODE  
OF  
BAPTISM

---

ASCERTAINED TO BE SPRINKLING.

---



THE  
**SCRIPTURE MODE**

OF

**BAPTISM**

ASCERTAINED TO BE SPRINKLING.

IN TWO PARTS.

- I. THE MODE OF WATER BAPTISM.
- II. THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

DESIGNED FOR PLAIN READERS.

---

BY REV. J. A. CORNWALL,  
OF THE OREGON PRESBYTERY.

---

LOUISVILLE, KY.:

PRINTED BY A. F. COX.

For sale at the Rooms of the Cumberland Presbyterian Book Concern.

1856.

SCB  
10547

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2011 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library



## RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON PRESBYTERY,

*Passed at the Spring Session of 1855.*

*Whereas*, Brother J. A. CORNWALL has been for some time engaged in preparing a work for the press, upon the subject of Baptism, adapted expressly to the wants of our Church in Oregon ; and has at this Session of the Presbytery given an outline of his work, (in the form of a lecture) : therefore,

*Resolved*, unanimously, That so far as the Presbytery have been made acquainted with the manner in which said work is gotten up and arranged, they are free to recommend it to the members of our Church generally, and to those in Oregon in particular.

JAS. H. D. HENDERSON, *Mod.*

A. W. SWEENEY, *Clerk.*





## TO THE READER.

---

THE following is rather a compilation than an original work on Baptism. Most of the articles have been carefully selected from the best writers upon the subject. The introduction to chapters, a general introduction, and some of the articles are original. The work professes to combine the chief excellencies of Drs. E. Hall and A. Peters, of New England, and Dr. Edward Beecher, formerly of Illinois College. To distinguish him from his reverend sire, I have chosen to designate him in this work as Pres. Beecher. He has pushed the investigation of the subject further, perhaps, than any other man, and done more than any other towards settling the controversy, by ascertaining the true import of the original terms employed and the design of the ordinance. I have drawn more liberally from his pages than from any other work. I have also extracted freely from

Dr. Rice's part of the celebrated debate by Rice and Campbell, held in Lexington, Ky., in 1843. Moreover, I have availed myself of several articles by other writers upon the subject of baptism.

The *plan* of the work is this: Part *First*, (on the Mode of Baptism) the first chapter, includes the institution of the ordinance, the present state of the controversy, the origin of immersion, etc.; the second and third chapters are devoted to the import of baptizo and baptismos. The second gives the philological definition, and the third the scriptural definition of these terms. The fourth chapter embraces the arguments directly upon the mode of baptism, and the fourth is composed of the historical illustrations of the modes drawn from the New Testament and the early history of the Church.

Part *Second* contains two chapters upon the subject of Spiritual Baptism. And it is contemplated, should the life of the author be spared a little longer, to add a *Third Part* to the work, to include the Scripture Warrant for the membership and baptism of infants.

In the preparation of the work, I have been careful on the one hand, to omit nothing that

appeared actually necessary to the elucidation of the subject, and on the other, to prevent its becoming too lengthy to suit common readers. Should any one, however, conclude that it is too much for his time and patience, he may pursue the following course of reading, and still obtain a good degree of information upon the subject of baptism. Begin with the description of baptism at the close of the introduction, (page 25,) then take up Chapters III and IV of the First Part, and Chapter II of the Second Part. He then will be very likely to turn back with interest enough to peruse the whole.

May the Great Head of the Church bless this feeble effort in the dissipation of error and falsehood, and the dissemination of the truth.

YAM HILL CO., OREGON TERRITORY,

*July 4th, A. D. 1855.*



## CONTENTS.

	Page.
INTRODUCTION, -	13
Description or Design of Baptism,	21

### PART I.

#### THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

##### CHAPTER I.

<i>General Remarks,</i>	25
§ 1. The Institution of Baptism,	26
§ 2. Present Position of the Baptists and State of the Controversy,	30
§ 3. Inference from the Opposite System,	33
§ 4. Causes which led to the early practice of Im- mersion, and to the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration,	35
§ 5. Statement of the Case, and principles of Investigation,	40
§ 6. Causes of the Disregard of these Principles, and the Consequences,	42

##### CHAPTER II.

#### *Import of the Word Bapizo and its Derivatives.—*

<i>Philological Definition</i>	46
§ 7. The Jewish Idiom of the Greek Language,	49
§ 8. Translating the word Baptizo,	54
§ 9. Transferring Peculiar Words from one Lan- guage to Another,	57

	Page.
§ 10. Meaning of Bapto — the Root, - - - - -	61
§ 11. Import of the Word Baptizo, - - - - -	64
§ 12. Process by which Words pass from one Meaning to another, - - - - -	70

### CHAPTER III.

<i>Import of Baptizo.—The Scripture Idea of Baptism,</i> - - - - -	76
§ 13. The Sacrificial Sense of Baptizo - - - - -	77
§ 14. Old Testament Prophecies — Expectation that the Messiah would Purify or Baptize, - - - - -	80
§ 15. New Testament Definition of Baptizo or Baptize, - - - - -	84
§ 16. Definition of Baptizo — Apocrypha and Josephus, - - - - -	90
§ 17. Definition of Baptizo and Baptisma, as given by the Fathers, - - - - -	93
§ 18. Relation to System of Writers, - - - - -	98
§ 19. The Final Result — Purification, - - - - -	101

### CHAPTER IV.

<i>The Scripture Mode of Baptism,</i> - - - - -	107
§ 20. Jewish Purification — Baptism, - - - - -	108
§ 21. Levitical Purification — Baptism, - - - - -	115
§ 22. Purification by the Blood of Christ— Sprinkling, - - - - -	119
§ 23. Purification by the Holy Ghost—Baptism by Pouring and Sprinkling, - - - - -	124
§ 24. Language of Prophecy — Sprinkling - - - - -	129
§ 25. Use of the Prepositions — Sprinkling, - - - - -	135
§ 26. Baptism of Blood, of Fire, of Tears, and of the Truth — Sprinkling, - - - - -	139

## CHAPTER V.

	Page.
<i>Historical Illustrations of the Mode of Baptism,</i>	145
§ 27. Nature and Design of John's Baptism — Baptism of Christ, - - - - -	146
§ 28. Mode of John's Baptism — Sprinkling -	150
§ 29. Baptism of Three Thousand on the Day of Pentecost — Sprinkling, - - - - -	156
§ 30. Baptism of the Eunuch and of Christ — Sprinkling — The Greek Particles translated <i>into</i> and <i>out of</i> , - - - - -	159
§ 31. Other instances of Apostolic Baptism — the Apostle Paul, Cornelius, Lydia, the Jailer, and two other Cases — Sprinkling, - - - - -	165
§ 32. Testimony of History — Sprinkling, -	169
§ 33. Recapitulation, - - - - -	173

## PART II.

## SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

## CHAPTER I.

<i>The Baptism of the Holy Ghost, - - - - -</i>	178
§ 34. The Reality of Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	179
§ 35. The Perpetuity of Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	184
§ 36. The Author or Agent employed in Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	188
§ 37. The Means Employed in Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	193
§ 38. The Nature of Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	199
§ 39. And the Effects of Spiritual Baptism, - - - - -	204

## CHAPTER II.

<i>Interpretation of Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, - - - - -</i>	210
§ 40. Importance of a Correct Interpretation of Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, - - - - -	210

	Page.
§ 41. Points at Issue — Principles of Reasoning,	213
§ 42. Position to be Proved — Sources of Evidence,	214
§ 43. Course of the Argument, and Logical Exigencies,	216
§ 44. The Mode of Speech employed, as to Spiritual Death, Burial, Resurrection, etc.,	221
§ 45. The Congruity of the Interpretation with the General System of Truth,	229
§ 46. The Moral Tendency and Effects of Each Mode of Interpretation,	232
§ 47. Objections from Authority Considered.	236
§ 48. Apostolic Practice Considered,	239
§ 49. The Final Result,	240



## INTRODUCTION.

---

It is natural to expect some apology for engaging in the discussion of the subject of baptism at the present time, when there is so much said and written upon that perplexing controversy. Mine is, I have long felt the need of a work on baptism, suited to the wants of common readers, who compose the mass of community, as well as a large majority of church members. So far as I am acquainted, most of the works extant are, in my opinion, either too long or too learned to suit that respectable class of readers ; or they are too short to afford the information necessary upon that difficult subject. Rendered difficult by so much discussion of a character better calculated to darken the subject, and to divide the Body of Christ, than to elucidate the subject thus obviously rendered perplexing. Besides, a standard work on baptism is still a desideratum in our branch of the Christian Church. Moreover, the present advanced state of biblical literature imperiously demands such a work. Truth is evidently in a state of continual development. It is a fact well known to Bible students generally, that a great many texts of scripture, which were formerly understood to refer to material or water baptism, evidently refer to spiritual baptism or the work of the Holy Spirit on the heart of the believer ; and are still retained in some of the most popular works on baptism, and in some of the best notes and comments on the sacred pages ; also in more than half the references in our Confession of Faith.

Furthermore, the great diversity of views entertained by the members of Christ's visible church respecting an ordinance of the New Testament, is a subject of deep regret, and calls loudly upon all parties to contribute their respective mites, in the way of Christian forbearance and compromise, to bring about that state of reconciliation and fraternal feeling, so desirable in this present age of advancement.

It is painful to reflect that each party manifests such an unyielding, uncompromising spirit as we are often called to witness — such a spirit of exclusion. For instance: Immersionists, with the greatest confidence, denounce all others as unbaptized; and arrogate to themselves the exclusive right to settle the mode of baptism, and to give to the world faithful translations of the word of God accordingly. While a few of our Pedobaptist brethren appear fully as rigid and dogmatical, in their exclusion and proscription. Now in my view, they are equally extravagant, in setting up their respective claims to infallibility, — as "growing wise above what is written," and forming hasty conclusions, without reaching them by a regular induction of facts. This spirit of entire exclusion, if carried out retrospectively, would inevitably unchurch both parties. For it is a fact too notorious to admit of denial, that the practice of immersion as a mode of baptism, prevailed almost universally, at a very early age of the Christian Church. So that the opposers of this mode, by pushing the subject too far, may trace his favorite mode, through by-gone generations, till he arrives at the period when sprinkling was not recognized as a mode except in cases of emergency — the baptism of persons confined to beds of sickness, supposed to be beyond recovery. On the other hand, the advocate for immersion as the only mode of Christian baptism, may trace his baptism to different periods in the history of the Church,

when sprinkling generally, if not universally prevailed. Hence, upon this plan of exclusion and proscription, both parties are necessarily subjected to the same inconvenience of excluding themselves from the Church of Christ, and thus, so far as a regular succession is concerned, depriving themselves of Christian baptism, as the unavoidable consequence.

Under the existing state of things, more uniformity of sentiment is desirable, upon a subject in theology of such vast importance ; and should be attained as soon as possible. And we are persuaded that it is attainable ; for it is not the will of God that any part of revealed truth should long remain involved in clouds and darkness. And we think with Pres. Beecher, that such an uniformity will ultimately be effected by the recognition of all the modes of baptism now practiced among evangelical Christians as valid. But whether they all can produce equal claims, with respect to the *design, signifi- cancy, convenience, etc.*, involves another question, and entirely distinct. But to arrive at the truth upon the subject, it becomes necessary to divest ourselves, as far as possible, of our former modes of thinking, association of ideas, prejudices, and so on ; and to turn to the great commission given, and inquire, Is the command to baptize *specific* and *modal* ? or is it *open* or *generic* ? For instance : Is it specific, as go *sprinkle* all nations ? or go *immerse* all nations ? Or is it an open command ? as go *baptize*, go *wash*, go *purify* all the nations ? The answer is at hand. The command is *not* specific and modal, but generic, and may be performed by any mode of application, as by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. Let each branch of Christ's Church choose whatever mode may suit its convenience best, and every member exercise Christian liberty, and select that particular mode which best suits his or her particular views, and exercise a spirit

of charity and Christian forbearance towards all others who may differ from him in sentiment, and the desirable object is at once attained. And if the great Head of the Church recognizes the external ordinance administered in different modes — as we are persuaded he does — and vouchsafes the inward grace, why not we too recognize it, extend to all the hand of fellowship, and greet them with a hearty welcome into the visible family of God ?

The inquiry then naturally arises, Why then investigate the subject at all ? if we admit that the command to baptize is fully met by any mode of application of water ? The answer to this is also at hand, and is two-fold : (1.) Our Baptist brethren deny that we are baptized persons ; and of course we are out of the visible Church, and not entitled to a participation with them in the ordinance of the Supper. And therefore they will not accord to us the privileges of Christian fellowship — which is the legitimate right of all God's children,—nor even an equal share of common intelligence. (2.) The dogma of exclusive immersion has ever been a fruitful source of errors of the most vital nature, from the baptismal regeneration\* of the primitive Church to the Campbellism and Mormonism of the present day.

A great many Pedobaptists have been at a loss to account for the rise and prevalence of the doctrine of immersion and baptismal regeneration at so early an age of the Christian Church ; for they are twin sisters, and generally go hand in hand. This subject will receive ample attention at the proper place in the work. (See § 4.) I will merely remark here, that the doctrine in question, so dishonoring to God and so subversive of vital piety in the Church, is evidently an innovation upon

\* This doctrine as taught by the Fathers, was of a different type, and not of that vital character of Campbellism of modern times.

primitive practice. But we come now more directly to the subject of discussion.

Baptizo and baptismos — the original terms for baptize and baptism — are of Greek origin, and were not translated in our New Testament, except in some three or four instances, but merely transferred, with the English terminations *ize* and *ism*. The wisdom of God is manifest in the selection of a word from a polished language, which had never been employed by the Greeks themselves in a religious sense, and consecrating it to the service of the sanctuary, to signify a divine rite — the emblem of a sacred purification — through all coming time. Should not this remarkable circumstance administer a gentle rebuke to all who are so clamorous against Pedobaptists ; charging them with mistranslating the Scriptures with the obvious design of suppressing the truth, and misleading the people upon the subject of baptism ? And should it not be a hint to all who are engaged in the translation of the Word of God, to imitate these venerable men who prepared our English version, and transfer the original terms with suitable terminations, into all the languages and dialects of earth ; and thus preserve the original term as a universal one, indicating a standing ordinance of the Church ? For to transfer words from one language to another is not to mistranslate them, but merely to enlarge and enrich another language. The words Messiah, Emanuel, Christ and Jesus, were all transferred from the Hebrew and Greek into English ; and the words immerse and immersion, were in like manner transferred from the Latin ; and so of a multitude of our English words. They were introduced from other languages, both living and dead.

But what renders the word baptizo more difficult to ascertain, is not the simple fact that it belongs to a foreign language, but also to a dead one. The ancient Greek

has long since ceased to be a living spoken language ; and the additional fact, that the New Testament was not written in classic Greek, but in what may be termed the Jewish idiom of the Greek language ; or what is called in the schools, the Alexandrian Greek. And it is worthy of remark that while it remained a living language, there was no controversy whatever with regard to baptism. Although the Greek Fathers wrote so much, and upon every subject in theology, still not a trace exists concerning any controversy about baptism. This shows conclusively that this controversy is one of modern date. Hence the necessity that the anxious inquirer after the truth as to the mode of baptism, should travel back into the New Testament age, and become acquainted, as far as possible, with all the circumstances connected with the subject ; such as the dispersion of the Jews among the surrounding nations, political changes, manners and customs, religious ceremonies, modes of thought, etc. And especially an acquaintance with the Greek Fathers, who lived and wrote for several successive centuries after the Apostolic age, will be of great service in arriving at the true import of the term baptizo, and its derivatives. For there is no one truth more evident than that every man — especially every learned man — is acquainted with his own mother tongue, in which he was born.

The conquests of Alexander, about three centuries before the Christian era, by which the Greek language became general throughout the East, and the translation of the Old Testament scriptures into that language a short time after — called the Septuagint version — were some of the steps pursued by Divine Providence in preparing the way for the gospel dispensation. By these means, the Greek language became, so to speak, the circulating medium of divine truth, and was now applied to a subject altogether new. Hence it is, that a great many words

have passed from their primary meaning — from a common or profane use, to that of a secondary or religious application ; and thus assumed a sense which the heathen Greeks never attached to them ; — and baptizo among the rest. This important word appears to be left entirely out of view, by a great many, in discussing the subject of baptism. Writers generally, of both sides of the question, will resort to the classical usage of the terms employed, and confine them to their primary meaning, at the same time making them specific, as *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*, etc. ; on the other hand, the definition is extended in its application, so as to include *wash*, *pour*, *sprinkle*, etc., making them also specific and modal.

Now it is evident that this mode of procedure will never bring about that unity which is the mind of the Spirit, and at the same time so desirable among Christians. Thus it is, that both parties lose sight of the New Testament or religious application of the term — baptizo — to *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*, which is generic, and may be performed by any mode of application. Pres. Beecher says : “The Septuagint, the New Testament, and the Greek Fathers, belong to one system of writers. The writers of the New Testament were affected by the Septuagint, in their style and use of words. The Fathers were affected by both.”

Baptism is an ancient rite or Jewish practice ; and it was employed both for ceremonial purposes and the introduction of Gentile proselytes. As such, John practiced the rite under the Levitical dispensation. And the Saviour, in the institution of Christian baptism, did not introduce a new rite into the Church, but employed an old one, already in use and well understood, with a meaning somewhat different and more significant.

There are likewise some circumstances connected with baptism, which are worthy of notice, as peculiar to the

first age of Christianity : such as faith as a prerequisite to baptism, its connection with the remission of sins, and its connection with the gift of the Holy Ghost. It is said in connection with the commission to baptize, “ He that *believeth* and is baptized, shall be saved.” Leaving the inference clear, according to the views of the Baptist brethren, that infants and all others incapable of the exercise of faith, are not proper subjects of that ordinance : thus arriving at a false conclusion, by being misled in the premises. The facts are these : the wall of partition that had hitherto separated between the Jew and the Gentile, was now taken down, and the gospel was to be preached also to the Gentiles, who were henceforth to be fellow-heirs with the Jews, in the covenant of promise and privileges of the Church. In the discharge of the great commission, adults, who are capable of faith, are addressed ; and they are required first to believe, and then to be baptized,— they and their children. There must first be a beginning, in laying the foundation of the Christian Church among the Gentiles. So the allusion in that and similar texts, is to the faith of the adult alone, as a prerequisite to baptism ; and it is both unfair and impertinent, to bring that objection to bear upon the subject of the baptism and membership of infants.

It was said to the convicted Jews, in Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost, “ Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins.*” And under circumstances somewhat similar Ananias said unto Saul, “ Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord.” In these passages, baptism for the remission of sins, in some sense or other, is brought to view ; which has a reference peculiar to the age, the circumstances, and to the individuals addressed. For in all the instances recorded of the Apostles’ preaching to the Gentiles, no such lan-

guage anywhere occurs. When Peter in his discourse charged the Jews with the sin of crucifying their own Messiah, they were cut to the heart, and cried, Men and brethren, what must we do ? The answer was, Repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ—in that very name which you have scornfully rejected and blasphemed, saying “ Away with him ; crucify him, crucify him ; his blood be upon us and our children.” Baptism in, or into the *name* of Christ, is a solemn recognition of Christ, and a formal union with his body, the visible Church. And this act was to those Jews, his guilty murderers, the only terms upon which their sins could be pardoned or remitted, particularly the sin of renouncing the only name by which men may be saved, and crucifying the Lord of Life and Glory. The case of Saul of Tarsus was somewhat similar. He had been a wicked persecutor of the saints, and had also rejected and blasphemed the name of Christ. But he was now a penitent at the door of mercy. And he trembling, and astonished, said, “ Lord what wilt thou have me to do ? ” And he was directed by Ananias to arise forthwith and be baptized, *calling on that very name* for pardon and reconciliation, and then to wash away that foul blot from his conscience and his character — the particular sin of blasphemy and persecution. This I take to be the primary meaning of these texts, which have long been a source of contention. It is admitted, however, that there may be at the same time a secondary reference to the general meaning of baptism, as significant of pardon and remission. According to this view, these passages are of easy solution and of a peculiar application.

And the gift of the Holy Ghost, in all the plenitude of his miraculous powers, was likewise peculiar to the Apostolic age ; and was generally conferred at the time of baptism, by the imposition of hands. But in the case of

Cornelius and his companions, the Holy Ghost was shed forth upon them before the administration of water baptism. Now this gift or baptism of the Holy Spirit, appears to have been the immediate province of Christ himself—in that age—and for a special purpose; and it was conferred either through the intervention of means, or independent of all instrumentality; and it ceased altogether in its extraordinary character as soon as its objects were accomplished. It enabled its possessors to speak with other tongues, to prophesy, and to work miracles, and appears not to have been confined exclusively to regenerated persons, but to have been shared to some extent, by mere nominal professors. But these miraculous gifts ought to be carefully distinguished from the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as it is continued in the Church at the present day; and which unites the soul to Christ, and thus identifies the believer with his mystical body—the Church invisible. This spiritual baptism seems to be the immediate province of the Holy Spirit, in his diversified operations, and is to be perpetuated in the Church through all succeeding ages.

And finally, it only remains to add a brief description of the *design* or *intention* of baptism,\* as brought to view in the New Testament, which corresponds in several particulars with the more ancient rite of circumcision under the Old Testament dispensation.

Baptism is an ordinance of the Christian Church. It has often been described, as the application of water, in any mode, by an authorized minister of the gospel, to a

\* I will here enter my protest against the doctrine of immersionists generally, that baptism is designed to be a standing monument of the Saviour's death, burial, and resurrection. This idea directly intrudes one of the ordinances of the Christian Church upon the province of another—that of the Supper. I will also protest against the idea of Christ's being baptized for an example to believers; and against there being any command to follow him in the ordinance of baptism.

proper subject, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But this is at best a very vague and indefinite definition or description of the ordinance of baptism ; and therefore, I submit the following :

1. Baptism is the rite of initiation into the Church of Christ. It is making a public *profession* of Christianity, by coming out from the world, and becoming formally united to, and identified with, the people of God.\* Paul thus describes the baptism of John, (Acts xix, 4) : “ John verily baptized with the baptism of *repentance*, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him, which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.”

2. Baptism is also an outward *sign* or *emblem* of an inward or spiritual cleansing, and a *seal* of the righteousness of faith. Rom. iv, 11. The person is baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Acts ii, 29 ; xxii, 16,) which is “ through faith in his blood, so that God is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” Rom. iii, 25, 26. It *seals* to the person baptized, all the promised blessings of the new covenant, which, on the part of God, will be afforded in due time.

3. And baptism *into* Jesus Christ, or *into* the body of Christ, is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It *purifies* the heart of the believer, *unites* the soul to Christ the living Head, and identifies it with his mystical body — the Church invisible. 1 Cor. xii, 13 ; Gal. iii, 27. It is also a *death* to sin, and a *resurrection* to a new and holy life. Rom. vi, 3, 4 ; Col. ii, 12 ; iii, 3. This is the reality — the antitype of water baptism ; and is in fact the *remission of sins*, effected by the “ washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

\* With regard to infants. Baptism is the dedication of the children of the Church to God, by bringing them into covenant union with him, and thus placing the seal of the covenant upon them, in the name of the Holy Trinity : that the needed blessing — spiritual purification — may be forth-coming in due season.—Acts ii, 39.



## PART I.

---

### THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### GENERAL REMARKS.

ALL denominations of Christians, except one, recognize the rite of baptism performed in any of the modes usually practiced, as valid : viz., sprinkling, pouring, or immersion ; still they do not at the same time admit that it is wholly a matter of indifference as to the mode of administration. On the other hand, they deem it a matter of the very first importance, in view of the vast consequences involved. They regard immersion, it is true, as a valid, but an awkward and inconvenient mode ; not, indeed, because it is immersion, but simply because it is one mode of purification. But it so happens that almost all who believe in, and practice immersion in modern times, oppose the baptism and membership of infants ; and that, not as a necessary consequence, for formerly infants as well as adults were immersed. Still there is something connected with immersion which is incompatible with the time-honored practice of infant baptism. Moreover, immersion as a mode of baptism, is not adapted to the propagation of the Gospel, agreeably to the Saviour's last command, in northern latitudes. Hence we give the

decided preference to sprinkling\* as a mode of baptism, the most convenient for all climes and conditions in life, as well as the most appropriate and significant, and the one chosen by the Holy Spirit to symbolize spiritual purification.

### § 1.—THE INSTITUTION OF BAPTISM.

The last command of our Saviour to his disciples, was addressed to them after his resurrection, when, having finished his personal ministry on earth, he was about to ascend his throne. The occasion was solemn and memorable. “Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him they worshiped him, but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Mat. xxviii, 16–20. This command is recorded by another evangelist, and in different words: “And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.*” Mark xvi, 15, 16.

\* The use of the word *sprinkling* in preference to *aspersion*, *affusion*, or *pouring*, is because it is more familiar in common parlance, and is used in Scripture, to express the mode of baptism, as it is generally practiced. It is also a better translation of the Greek word Rantizo in the Septuagint, and as used by the Apostle, Heb. ix, 10, in reference to the “divers washings”\*\* prescribed under the law. I wish it to be understood, however, that I mean by the word any application of water to the subject of baptism, in larger or smaller quantities, according to the original signification of Rantizo, which is to *pour all over*; to *wet*; *besprinkle*. Dr. Peters, p. 13.

\*\* Divers baptisms in the original.

"These passages contain the only recorded institution of Christian baptism.\* The Disciples, it is true, had before this *baptized*. But there is no proof that they had done so in the form which is here prescribed, and there is no evidence that the Saviour had before required baptism to be performed in these words. In his last command, therefore, as recorded in the above passages, is contained the whole of our direct authority, from Christ himself, for the administration of this ordinance. Here Christian baptism was instituted. This is our only divine warrant to baptize *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*.

"This command, to *baptize*, no doubt, has a definite meaning — a meaning which was understood by those to whom it was primarily addressed, and which ought to be understood by us. And yet, it is expressed in the fewest words possible. It is accompanied with no commentary, no explanation of the words. It means just what the words meant, *then and there*. And the very brevity of the expression, and the incidental manner in which the duty was inculcated in the command, indicate that there must have been, present to the minds of the Apostles, circumstances and considerations which rendered the words perfectly intelligible to them. They, accordingly, received the command asking no explanation, and went forth in obedience to it, and administered baptism to their disciples.

\* Pres. Beecher says, pp. 206-'7, "The commission was not omitted by Luke and John, that a commission to baptize is in fact a commission to purify, that is, a commission to remit sins — and in Luke and John, the Disciples do receive a commission to remit sins. Luke xxiv, 47, 48. 'That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, and ye are witnesses of these things.' In John the phraseology is different from that of Luke. 'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.' John xx, 23. This may be affirmed in view of the authority which was given the Disciples; and the remission of sins was in the name of Jesus Christ."

“ It should also be remarked, that the administration of this ordinance, in the time of the Apostles, being a matter of visible practice, the *mode* of it was of course seen and understood by those who received it. It seems indeed, to have been understood alike by the primitive Disciples. Hence we hear of no dispute or division among them concerning it. They either agreed in a particular mode, which they understood to be embraced in the meaning of the command, or they regarded the *spirit* of the institution as *alone* essential, and felt at liberty to vary the *mode* to meet circumstances and occasions. Accordingly there was no need of any explanation, to them, of the mode of the ordinance. The visible practice of the thing, which they called baptism, explained itself in this respect.

“ But there have come dark ages over the church and the world. Scarcely had the Apostles been laid in their graves, when a fancy began to prevail, that there was a cleansing power in water baptism. The strange notion of ‘*baptismal regeneration*’ was imbibed by professing Christians, and a mode of baptism was no doubt adopted, to imply and perpetuate that idea. Forms and ceremonies were soon introduced from the heathen worship, and monstrous abuses were practiced, which continue to the present day, both in the Romish and Greek churches. The spirit of the institution was buried and lost under the accumulation of its borrowed accompaniments. The leaders of the Protestant Reformation, therefore, have found it necessary to go back to the Bible, to recover the original meaning of this and other ordinances of the Gospel.

“ For reasons, however, which I have already intimated, the import of the Saviour’s brief command on this subject, is not so readily apprehended by us as by the primitive Disciples. The single word *baptizo* which

defines the ordinance, is not, with us, vernacular, (*i.e.* spoken,) and we are far removed from the usages of those times in our personal experience. We labor, therefore, under some disadvantages in our endeavors to ascertain the precise truth, as to the original mode of the ordinance. Yet the institution, in its primitive purity, is deemed so important, that learning and ignorance, simple piety and sectarian zeal, have all been deeply and perseveringly engaged in its investigation.

"The sad result is a controversy, wide spread among evangelical Christians, as to the mode in which we are required to fulfill this last command of our Saviour. And what is still more sad, principles have been adopted by some parties, which have divided the church, and broken her visible communion.

"In such a state of things, if there be any key to the discovery of the root of this evil, and any principle which may promise to restore the body of the faithful to its primitive unity, surely every conscientious Christian will rejoice to find it. At least every one rightly affected on this subject, will see to it, that he is not himself, through ignorance of the Saviour's command, a schismatic, or an occasion of division among the people of God.

"In what *mode*, then, did the Apostles understand that they were to obey the command of Christ to baptize? To answer this question satisfactorily, we must place ourselves, as far a possible, in their circumstances, and look out upon the truths and usages which must have controlled their perception of the meaning of the words and things embraced in this command." *Dr. Peters, pp. 13-19.*

"On this subject," says Pres. Beecher, p. 117, "two opposing systems are in conflict. One based on the performance of a special act, *i. e.* *immersion*—the other, on indicating an effect, *i. e.* *purification*. Each of these systems tends to results peculiar to itself. By these results

the true nature of each system will be evolved, and in consequence of them, its soundness will be tested. Such is God's method of bringing false systems to a close."

## § 2. PRESENT POSITION OF THE BAPTISTS—STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY.

"The system based on the performance of a specific act is evolved. Let us look at its results, as seen in the present position of its advocates.

"The denomination of evangelical Baptists is large, universally diffused, and very active. It is, in all the movements of the church, a constantly operating force. Of course the position they assume, as it regards other denominations, is a matter of no small consequence. They have it in their power universally to affect the tranquillity of Zion. We shall, therefore, briefly consider the position which they do in fact assume. This can be easily inferred by carrying out logically the following principles —that baptism is essential to church membership, and that the command to baptize is a command to immerse. From these principles, they infer :

1. That all other denominations are unbaptized, because unimmersed, and that they are, therefore, in a state of disobedience to God.

2. That other denominations cannot be recognized and treated by them as members of the church of Christ, because unbaptized, and are therefore to be excluded on this ground, from communion with them at the table of the Lord.

3. That other denominations are guilty of mistranslating the Word of God, or of at least covering up its sense on the subject of baptism.

4. That to the Baptist denomination is assigned the great work of giving correct translations of the Bible to the world, and of restoring the Gospel to its primitive purity and simplicity.

"These positions are not with them mere points of theory, but have been, of late, with increasing vigor and decision, reduced to practice. They have also assumed a tone of uncommon decision and boldness in announcing their principles, as if their correctness were beyond all question. Nay, too often have many of them spoken with contempt and ridicule, not to say insolence, of those who hold the opposite opinion, as if they were holding on to exploded errors, in the face of all the learning of the modern world, and even against their own better knowledge.

"Prof. Eaton, of Hamilton Baptist Institute, in his speech before the Baptist Bible Society, at their anniversary of 1840, says, Report p. 74, 'the translation' of the Baptist Missionaries, 'is so undeniably correct,' that its uncorrectness could not be pretended, without committing the objector's character for scholarship and candor. 'Who are they,' sir, said he, 'who cavil about the plain meaning of the original word whose translation is so offensive? Are they the Persons, and the Campbells, and the Greenfields, and such like? No sir. But the cavilers are men who, whatever may be their standing in other respects, have no reputation as linguists and philologists to lose. There really can be no rational doubt in the mind of any sound and candid Greek scholar, about the evident meaning of the word in question. I venture to say, at the risk of the little reputation for Greek scholarship which I possess, that there are no words of plainer import in the Bible. The profane tampering which has been applied to these words,'" &c. &c. See Hall's *Baptist Errors*, p. 39.

"Mr. Hinton, after an argument on the import of the word *baptizo*, and professed history of the origin and progress of pouring and sprinkling, says, pp. 196-'7, may I respectfully ask the Pedo-Baptist who reads this volume,

(Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Methodist,) 1. Whether he has not been *kept in ignorance* of these facts ? 2. Whether those clergy who withhold these facts from their flocks, do not take upon themselves an undue and dangerous responsibility ? 3. Whether he will have independence enough to take every adequate means to ascertain if these statements can be denied ? And finally, if they cannot be gainsayed, whether he will dare to remain unbaptized, and therefore in a state of disobedience to the King of kings ? ”

“ On the 28th of April, 1840, the Baptist American and Foreign Bible Society, passed the following resolution: *Resolved*, that by the fact that the nations of the earth must now look to the Baptist denomination **ALONE** for faithful translations of the Word of God, a responsibility is imposed upon them, demanding its full discharge, an unwonted degree of union, of devotion, and of strenuous, persevering effort throughout the entire body.” Moved by Prof. Eaton, seconded by Rev. H. Malcom.

“ In their report, this society stigmatize the translation of all other denominations, as ‘versons in which the real meaning of words \* \* \* is PURPOSELY KEPT OUT OF SIGHT, so that Baptists cannot circulate faithful versions \* \* \* unless they print them at their own expense.’ They assert, p. 4, ‘It is known that the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the American Bible Society, have virtually combined to obscure, at least, a part of the divine revelation, and that these societies continue to circulate versions of the Bible unfaithful, at least so far as the subject of baptism is concerned.’ ”  
*Hall on Baptism*, 27, 28.

Again Prof. Eaton says, Report, p. 7-9, “ Never, sir, was there a chord struck, that vibrated simultaneously through so many **BAPTIST** hearts from one extremity of the land to the other, as when it was announced that the *heathen world*

*must look to THEM ALONE for an unveiled view of the glories of the GOSPEL OF CHRIST.*

"A deep conviction seized the minds of almost the whole body, that they were *divinely and peculiarly set* for the defense and the dissemination of the *Gospel* as delivered to man by its heavenly author. A new zeal in their master's cause, and unwonted kindlings of fraternal love glowed in their hearts; and an attracting and concentrating movement, reaching to the utmost extremity of the mass, began and has been going on and increasing in power ever since." *Hall's Baptist Errors*, p. 38. *Pres. Beecher*, pp. 117-120.

Many more facts of a similar kind might be adduced, were it necessary; but, these will suffice to give the reader something like a correct idea of the arrogant claims of the Baptists generally, and of that spirit of exclusion and proscription peculiar to Immersionists.\* On this ground, that union which is so desirable among the different branches of Christ's church; and that community of interests and of paternal feelings, among the members of his mystical body, which is the mind of the Spirit, are altogether out of the question.

"Indeed their whole body has been rallied by a universal impulse, as if on the eve of a general victory, and as if their triumph was destined to usher in the glories of the millenial day." *Beecher*, p. 120.

### § 3. INFERENCES FROM THE OPPOSITE SYSTEM.

"The logical consequences of the other system remain to be stated. These can easily be inferred from its fundamental position, THAT THERE IS NO COMMAND TO DIP OR IMMERSE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, BUT SOLELY A COMMAND TO PURIFY IN THE NAME OF THE TRINITY; and that each

\* By the word Baptist I include the whole family of Immersionists; and a portion of them are at this very time, (1855,) preparing a new version of the English Bible.

denomination may select for itself what it deems the most decorous and appropriate *mode* of fulfilling the command. This, if kindly received, is a conciliating view, and tends to unity; for it gives Christian liberty to all. So I presented it, and I hope for a kind and candid reception. My hopes have been disappointed. Efforts have been made to suppress it, by affected contempt of the view, and its advocate. Or it has been rejected with scorn, attended by uncalled for personal attacks upon the intellectual and religious character of its advocate. This I deeply regret, for I wrote with feelings of great kindness toward the Baptist denomination, and strong desires for unity in the love of Christ. But, perhaps, I ought not to be surprised. If the view I advocate is correct, *close communion must die*, and all the charges of Baptists against other denominations must be retracted, and their course as to the translation of the Bible, and the Bible Society, retraced. At all events, union and conciliation they reject; they still continue their attack.\* Hence logic must have its course.

"Of this system, the logical consequences are clear, and no Christian charity calls for their suppression. I announce them soberly, calmly, and yet decidedly, and as in the presence of a holy God,

1. That other denominations are not unbaptized, though unimmersed, because they are purified.

2. They are not substituting human form in the place of a commandment of God—nor are they in rebellion against God.

3. There is no good reason to exclude them from the table of the Lord; nor

\* Readers generally are not apprized of the fact, that when Pres. Beecher published the first part of his valuable work on Baptism, it drew down the displeasure of Baptists generally, and called forth a sharp reply from their great champion—the late Dr. Carson, of England, which drew from the President a reply in turn, and caused him to produce a thorough investigation of the subject. This accounts for the language used above.

4. Are they guilty of mistranslating nor obscuring the Word of God.

5. The Baptists mistranslate the Word of God—not only concealing its meaning, but putting in place of it, one entirely foreign to the mind of the Holy Spirit.

6. They are not divinely set apart to the great work of giving correct translations of the Bible to the heathen world; on the other hand, they are the only denomination who are combined systematically, to mistranslate it, and to hide its meaning from the world.

7. They are guilty of teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men, and because these will not comply with uncommanded external forms, of charging them with rebellion against God, and of excluding them from the table of the Lord. And

8. For the sake of this same uncommanded form, they have divided the Bible Society, and do still divide and agitate the Church of God.

“If the position on which this system rests is true, it needs no labored argument to show that these things are so. They are but its logical and necessary consequence. As such, I announce them.

“In one point, however, this system does not reverse the position of our Baptist brethren. It does not pronounce them unbaptized, nor exclude them from the table of the Lord. It admits that immersion is baptism, not indeed, because it is immersion, but solely because it is one mode of purification.” *Pres. Beecher, pp. 121, 122.*

#### § 4. CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE EARLY PRACTICE OF IMMERSION, AND TO THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

Upon this subject, Dr. Peters inquires, “How, then, it may be asked, did the practice of baptism by immersion come into use among the early Christian churches? For there is evidence sufficient to show that as early as

the second century immersiou was generally practiced, though it was not then claimed by any as the exclusive mode. Sprinkling never ceased to be held as valid baptism, in cases when, on account of sickness, or other causes, immersion was inconvenient or dangerous. And immersion, though practiced in the early ages, was never made an indispensable condition of communion by any sect until the rise of the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century.

"On the subject," continued he, "I remark, that it is impossible to trace all the steps of the rapid changes which so soon resulted in the ruinous corruption of the Romish Church. Even in the Apostles' days, there sprang up crude opinions and extravagant practices in the bosom of the Church. The Lord's Supper was so perverted by the church in Corinth, that the Apostle sharply rebukes them (1 Cor. xi) for their surfeiting and drunkenness. And so prone were they to abuse the institutions of the gospel, that in the first chapter of the same Epistle, Paul gives utterance to this strange declaration: 'I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say, that I baptized in my own name.'

"But in the second and third centuries, we find the state of things far more deplorable. Not only had the simple scriptural mode of baptism become changed, but monstrous abuses of it were introduced, as exorcism, unction, the giving of salt and milk to the candidate, clothing him in a snow-white robe, and crowning him with evergreen. It was in those ages that the imagination became prevalent, that there was a saving virtue in the water of baptism. It was therefore concluded that the more water the better, and that it should be applied to the whole body that the regeneration might be complete."

Upon the same subject, says Pres. Beecher: "On making the inquiry, it appears manifest to me, that the

practice in question did not originate in a belief that the word baptizo means immerse, but in entirely different and independent causes. Suppose now the word to mean to *purify*, it is neither impossible nor improbable that certain local and peculiar causes may have led to some one mode of purifying rather than another, and that this mode may have been immersion ; and if all these things may have been so, who has a right to assume, without proof, that they were not so ? I believe that they were. If it is inquired, What causes they were ? I answer, 1. Oriental usages and the habits of warm regions. 2. A false interpretation of Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12. And 3. A very early habit of ascribing peculiar virtue to external forms. The first cause is sufficient to begin the practice ; the other two to extend, perpetuate, and confirm it. Now if it can be shown that these causes did exist, and did operate, and had great power, then a sufficient account of the origin and progress of the usage *may be given by these alone*. . . . But of their existence or their power, can there be any doubt ? Did not Christianity begin in the warmer region of the East, and in the midst of a people whose climate, habits, costume, and mode of life, were all adapted to bathing ? and was not the practice nearly universal ? Hence nothing could be more natural than its use on *convenient occasions* as a mode of religious purifying ; and if, as some maintain, the form (immersion) had been previously used as a religious rite, nothing could be more natural than its adoption as a mode of purifying in the Church.

" As to the interpretation of Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, as referring to the external form, all may not be ready to concede that it was false ; yet that it was early prevalent and powerful, no one, I think, at all acquainted with the facts of the case, will deny. As I have before stated, our Baptist brethren regard these passages as an

inspired exposition of the mode of baptism—as proving irresistibly that the right is designed, not merely to represent purification from sin, but purification in a way significant of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and of the death, burial, and resurrection of the believer with him ; and although this signification of the rite was not seen by men when it was first established, yet it was fully before the mind of God, and was finally and fully disclosed by the Apostle Paul. . . . Nor are they without authority for interpreting these texts as referring to the mode of the external rite. Indeed the opinions of the Fathers, whatever they may be worth, so far as I have examined, are entirely with them. This explanation seems to have been adopted at a very early period. But it was most fully developed by Chrysostom ; and undoubtedly his authority and eloquence, more than those of any other man, tended to give it currency in the East, whilst the influence of Augustiné was equally decisive in the West.

“ As to a superstitious attachment to forms, who can deny it ? nay, who that is a Protestant does ? Evidence of it appears on every page, that records the early history of the Church. To omit all else, the history of this rite alone would furnish volumes of proof. Let the holy water—the baptismal chrism, to symbolize and bestow the Holy Spirit—the putting on of white robes after baptism, to symbolize the putting on of Christ—the baptism of men and women perfectly naked, to denote their entire nakedness before putting on Christ—let the anointing of the eyes and the ears, to denote the sanctification of the senses—let the eating of honey and milk, the signs of the cross ; and finally, let the baptismal regeneration—the sum and completion of all these formal tendencies—bear witness to the mournful truth. Now when the tendencies to formalism and superstition were

so all-pervading and almost omnipotent, what could avert a blind and superstitious devotion to an early form — one especially in which so much was supposed to be involved, both of emblematical import and of sanctifying power.” — *Pres. Beecher*, pp. 59, 60, and 84.

In addition to the above, the habits of the Eastern nations generally, and particularly in the warmer portions, consisted, to a great extent, in bathing and washing, with a view to cleanliness and health,— to leave religion out of view ; next, the Jewish ceremonial, with a number of traditions,— imposed by authority and honored by time— consisting, as it did, of a variety of washings and purifications, mostly by water — the particular mode of application not being prescribed, left it, as to modes, optionary with the worshiper ; all doubtless exerted an influence in preparing the way for the practice or usage in question. Moreover, the distinction between material and spiritual baptism was soon left out of view, and by an easy process, a mind naturally addicted to superstition, the thing signified — internal purification — was attached to the emblem itself ; and the inevitable consequence was, a host of errors of a vital nature ensued. And finally, the true import of several Scripture passages, being at the same time immersed in the flood of inundating errors, lent their influence in settling the matter, and giving it the sanction of inspiration itself. Such as “the washing of regeneration,” “born of the water,” and “having your bodies washed with pure water ;” and especially Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, which were taken in the external as we have seen. And to crown the whole, the superstitious notion, that some saving virtue was imparted to the water at the baptism of Christ, which they of course fancied was by immersion ; and this completes the picture, and immerses the Church with an immersion, from which it will doubtless require ages for her to emerge.

### § 5. STATEMENT OF THE CASE, AND PRINCIPLES OF INVESTIGATION.

"The case is this: Christ has enjoined the performance of a duty in the command to baptize.

"What is the duty enjoined? or, in other words, what does the word *baptize*, in which the command is given, mean? One of two things must be true:

1. "Either it is, as to mode, generic, denoting merely the production of an effect (as purity,) so that the command may be fulfilled in many ways; or, it is so specific, denoting a definite mode, that it can be fulfilled in but one way. To illustrate by an analogous case: Christ said, 'Go teach all nations.' Here the word go, is so generic as to include all modes of going which any one may choose to adopt. If a man walks, or runs, or rides, or sails, he equally fulfills the command. On the other hand, some king or ruler, for particular reasons, might command motion by a word entirely specific; as for example, that certain mourners should *walk* in a funeral procession. Now, it is plain that such a command could not be fulfilled by riding or by running, for though these are modes of going, they are not modes of walking, and the command is not to go in general, but specifically to walk. So when a general says *march*, it will not answer for soldiers to run; for though this is a mode of going, it is not a mode of marching.

"So likewise, when Christ said baptize, he either used a word which had a generic sense, denoting the production of an effect in any mode, such as *purify*, *cleanse*; or a specific sense, denoting a particular mode, such as *immerse*, *sprinkle*, *pour*.

2. "Which ever way we decide, as regards the import of the word, we ought to be uniform in its use, as applied to the rite of baptism. For though the same word may

have divers meanings when applied to different things, and in various circumstances, yet it certainly cannot when applied to the same thing, and in the same circumstances.

Hence, if we adopt the generic meaning, purify or cleanse, we must adhere to it at all times, when speaking of the rite. On the other hand, if we adopt a specific meaning, as immerse or sprinkle, we must adhere to it in the same way, and not pass from the generic to the specific, or from the specific to the generic, according to exigencies, on the ground that the word baptizo, may, in the whole circuit of its use, mean sometimes one thing and sometimes another. Nor must we adopt both, for however numerous the possible meanings of a word may be in its various usages, it has in each particular case but one meaning, and in all similar cases, its meaning is the same. Hence the word baptizo, as applied to a given rite, has not two or many meanings, but one, and to that one we should in all cases adhere.

" " If we adopt a generic meaning, denoting the production of an effect, we are not limited by the command to any specific mode of fulfilling it, and are at liberty to vary the mode according to circumstances. But if we adopt a specific meaning, denoting merely a mode, we are limited by the very import of the command to the range of that meaning.

" Hence if the command is to purify or cleanse, we are not limited by the command to any one mode, but may choose that which seems to us most appropriate, whether it be sprinkling, pouring, or immersion.

" But if the command is specific and modal, as immerse, then we are limited by the range of that word, and cannot fulfill the command by sprinkling or pouring, for these are not modes of immersion any more than riding is a mode of walking, or writing a mode of painting.

" It is true that sprinkling or pouring may be modes

of purifying,—and so is riding a mode of going. But if the command is not purify, but immerse, then all debate as to mode is at an end ; for you can immerse, not by sprinkling, but only by immersion.” — *Pres. Beecher*, pages 3, 4.

## §6. CAUSES OF THE DISREGARD OF THESE PRINCIPLES, AND THE CONSEQUENCES.

“ Though the principles stated are simple and obvious, yet the natural operations of the mind on questions of philosophy, have been in this case embarrassed and perplexed by certain influences of a kind peculiar to the word.

“ At the time of the translation of the Bible, a controversy had arisen as regards the import of the word, so that, although it was conceded to have an import in the original, yet it was impossible to assign to it in English any meaning without seeming to take sides in the controversy then pending.

“ Accordingly, in order to take neither side, they did not attempt to give the sense of the term in a significant English word, but merely transferred the word baptizo, with a slight alteration of termination to our language. The consequence was that it did not exhibit its original significancy, except what was derived from its application to designate an external visible rite. In short, it became merely the name of a rite, and had a usage strictly technical,\* and lost to the ear whatever significance it originally had.

“ The habit of using the word in a technical sense, has

\* This effect upon the mind is owing to the power of association of ideas. For instance : The mind of one who believes in, and is accustomed to the practice of immersion alone, whenever the word baptism occurs, involuntarily reverts to the mode immersion, and forgets that the term means anything else. So, on the other hand, a person accustomed to the practice of sprinkling alone, loses all idea of baptism meaning anything but sprinkling.

tended to unfit the mind for the discussion of the question as to the mode of baptism in various ways, of which I shall mention three.

1. "It has led to a departure from the principles already stated, that words when applied to the same subject, and in the same circumstances, cannot have a double sense. This rule, as has been remarked, does not forbid that the same word in different circumstances should have various senses; accordingly, it may be conceded that the word baptizo has various senses in the wide range of its usage, in scriptural and classical Greek: but out of this variety of usages, there is one strictly of a religious nature, and having a direct reference to one of the great revealed facts of Christianity. Now in a case like this, the laws of philology require that some one of the meanings of the word should be fixed on, and assigned to it in all cases. But the habit of using the word baptize in a strictly technical sense, as the name of a rite, has led to a disregard of this simple and obvious rule.

"Many writers, fixing their minds merely upon the idea of a rite, and finding that the word baptizo means sometimes to wash, sometimes to immerse, and sometimes, as they think, to pour or sprinkle, conclude that the rite of baptism may be performed in either way; entirely forgetting that, although the word should happen, in the wide range of its usage, scriptural and classical, secular and religious, to have all these meanings, it by no means follows, that when used as a religious term, and in certain circumstances, it means immerse: it does not also in similar circumstances mean to wet or to wash, to sprinkle or to pour, to color or to dye, but simply to immerse. And just as plainly, if in some cases of its religious uses, it means to purify, it does not in others of the same kind mean to pour, to sprinkle, or to immerse.

2. "The other mode in which the technical use of this

word has unfitted the mind for a fair consideration of the question is, it has permitted the introduction of a discussion as to the mode of baptism, after concessions have been made, which ought forever to exclude it. For example: The question arises, what meaning did the word baptizo convey to those, who in the age of the New Testament writers read the command, "Go baptize all nations?" Was it to immerse? So our brethren, the Baptists maintain; and so many who do not immerse, concede. Now after such a concession, with what propriety they can debate any longer as to the mode, I acknowledge that I cannot perceive. Nor do I think that they would do it were it not for an illusion practiced by the technical word, *baptize*, upon their minds.

"After admitting as a point of philology, that the word baptizo in its religious use means immerse, the mind seems to revert to the old habit of using the Anglicised word *baptism*, without attaching to it any meaning, and we are at once told that it is of no use to dispute as to the mode of baptism. Suppose now, instead of the word baptism, we substitute the meaning which it has been conceded to have, immerse, and the illusion is at once exposed. We concede that baptize means immerse, but of what use is it to dispute concerning the mode of immersion? Of none, surely, so you do but immerse. But can you immerse by sprinkling? Is sprinkling a mode of immersion? The fact is, that if the word denotes a given definite act, no other dissimilar act is, or can be, a mode of it. Pouring is not a mode of sprinkling or of immersion, nor is sprinkling a mode of pouring or of immersion, nor is immersion a mode of sprinkling or of pouring.

3. "Others again, still using the word as a technic, say that baptism is the application of water in any way, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the

Holy Ghost ; but base their conclusions rather on reason and the nature of the case, or on the design of the rite, than on a thorough philological investigation of the word. Now the defect of this last mode of reasoning is, that it does not interpret the command. It uses the word like a technic, having no meaning of its own ; and gives rather a description of a rite than a definition of baptizo.

"No one ever pretended to define baptizo as meaning 'to apply water in any way.' Of course, baptism cannot be defined to be the 'application of water in any way.' And whether this view of the rite is correct or not, must depend entirely on the meaning of the word." — *Pres. Beecher*, pp. 5, 7.

## THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER II.

#### THE IMPORT OF THE WORD BAPTIZO — THE PHILOLOGICAL DEFINITION.

I DESIGN to devote this chapter and the next to the investigation of the meaning of the word baptizo or baptize, as it appears in our Scriptures ; and endeavor, as far as possible, to divest it of that mysticism and embarrassment with which it is encumbered in a great many works upon the subject of baptism. I shall in this chapter present the subject to the reader upon principles *strictly philological*, by a brief, but thorough examination of the original term baptizo, according to the Greek of the New Testament ; and in the next chapter, to discuss the same subject upon evidence derived from the New Testament and other writings of that age *alone*, and ascertain the true import of the word baptize ; also from that source the scripture idea of baptism. And thus arrive at the same conclusion or result, through different and independent channels of information ; which will of course be doubly satisfactory to the anxious inquirer after truth. And here I will claim a calm and patient hearing from our Baptist brethren, for it is not my object to wound the feelings of those who differ with me, but if possible, to conduct them to the truth upon the subject of baptism.

Says Dr. Peters, (pp. 20-24) : “ Our Baptist brethren

maintain strenuously that the primary classical meaning of the word *baptizo*, is to *immerse*, or *dip*, and that the meaning of the word and its derivatives, used to designate the ordinance of baptism, must control the mode of its administration. On this ground principally they contend that *immersion, and nothing else, is baptism.*\* I say on this ground principally, because, though many other topics of argument are put forth in their writings, I think it will be made apparent, in the course of our discussion, that they are of little weight in comparison with this. This is regarded as the main point by our Baptist brethren themselves. It is, indeed, the only ground on which I can conceive that a candid *scholar* would be willing to take the exclusive position assumed by the ‘close communion Baptists.’ ”

“But the argument, on this ground, in favor of immersion derives all its strength from a mistaken assumption that *it is in point*, when, in fact, it has little or nothing to do with the subject. *Learned* men, on the Baptist side of the controversy, may have thus been led, by their familiarity with the Greek classics, to take up a false issue to

\* “The proportion of the Christian world who practice immersion or submersion, is very small. Of the sixty or seventy millions of Protestants of all denominations in the world, probably not a fiftieth part have been baptized in this way. Dr. Kurtz says: ‘Probably not one sixtieth part practice submersion.’ All the rest administer baptism by *aspersion* or *sprinkling*.

“I mention this fact rather as a matter of information than as an argument. And since our Baptist brethren sometimes claim the practice of the Greek Church in favor of their mode of baptism, it may be proper here to remark, that the Greek Church maintains that *trine* immersion—plunging three times—is absolutely necessary. After these immersions, they *sprinkle* the subject with water. They cannot be claimed therefore, as the exclusive supporters of either mode, while the Roman Catholic Church, whose example is quite as worthy of imitation, practices only sprinkling, so far as water is used. But these are both idolatrous churches, whose practice have no authority with us.” — *Doctor Peters*, pp. 20, 21.

which they have applied their philology, in a manner very satisfactory to themselves, while *prejudiced* men have felt it incumbent on them so to interpret the scripture expression relating to baptism, as to make them conform to the imperious demands of their philological argument. But their argument, as I have said—and will now proceed to show—has little or nothing to do with the subject."

"The question in dispute can never be settled by proving the meaning of the word *baptizo*, in ancient heathen Greek, though it is easy to show, and has been abundantly proved by our best philologists, that the argument is not wholly with the Baptists, even on that score. The word means *to tinge*, *to dye*, *to smear*, &c., as well as *to immerse*. The editor of Calmet's Dictionary, quotes some *eighty* examples, taken in part from the ancient fathers and classical writers, but mostly from the Bible, in every one of which, the word in question implies less than *submersion*, and in most of them, no more than *sprinkling*, *moistening*, *pouring*, or *staining*. But I leave that argument as wholly irrelevant to the precise point of difference between us and our Baptist brethren.

"The true question is, what was, and is, the *meaning* of the word *baptizo*, as used in the New Testament, to designate the religious ordinance of baptism? Suppose we admit—as we do not—all that the Baptists claim, as to the meaning of *baptizo* or *baptismos* (baptize and baptism) in heathen Greek. If it meant then *immersion and nothing else*, still that could not govern its meaning as used by Christ and his Apostles to designate an action which was utterly unknown to the Greeks of all preceding ages.

"Let it be remembered that the Greek language had never been used to express any of the ideas of revealed religion, until the Jews were conquered by the Greeks, some three hundred years before Christ."

Soon after the subjugation of the Jews by Alexander, they translated their own Scriptures into the Greek language; which version was called the Septuagint. This was done of necessity, from the fact, that the Hebrew had ceased to be vernacular among the common people. This version was the one in use in the days of the Saviour, and as mostly quoted by Christ and the Apostles, even the learned Paul not excepted.

#### § 7. THE JEWISH IDIOM OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

Pres. Beecher says upon this subject, "The Septuagint, the New Testament, and the Greek fathers, belong to our system of writers. The writers of the New Testament were affected by the Septuagint, in their style and use of words. The fathers were affected by both."

Says Prof. Robinson, in his preface to his Lexicon of the New Testament:

"A Lexicon of the New Testament, at the present day, *presupposes the fact*, that the language of the New Testament, exhibits in many points a departure from the idiom of the Attic Greek. This great question, which so long agitated the learned philologists of Europe, would seem at present to be put entirely at rest." The plan of his Lexicon, he says, is "in defining words, those significations are placed first, *which accord with Greek usage.*" "Then follow those significations *which depart from Greek usage*, and which are to be either illustrated from the Greek of the Septuagint, as compared with the Hebrew, OR DEPENDS SOLELY ON THE USUS LOQUENDI (customary use of words) OF THE NEW TESTAMENT writers."

"Dr. George Campbell, whom our Baptist brethren are fond of complimenting as one of the most finished Greek scholars of modern times, maintains that many of the idioms of the New Testament Greek would not have

been more intelligible to a classic Greek author than Arabic or Persian." "It is true," says he, "that as the New Testament is written in Greek, it must be of consequence that we be able to enter critically into the ordinary import of the words of that tongue. But from what has been observed, it is evident, that though in several cases their knowledge may be eminently useful, *it will not suffice*; nay, in many cases it will be of little or no significance. Classical use both in Greek and Latin, is not only, in this study *sometimes unavailable, but MAY EVEN MISLEAD*. *The sacred use and the classical are OFTEN VERY DIFFERENT.*"

Prof. Stuart, who stands in the first rank as a scholar and Bible critic, says, "If then the Jews and inspired writers did not speak and write classic Greek, if they used words not found in any classic authors, how can it be certain that they attached to the word baptizo the same meaning it had among the Pagan Greeks? Are we to be told, that it is certain that words used by two different nations, speaking different idioms of the same language, of different manners, habits, customs, and religion, have precisely the same meaning! The Greeks, it is admitted, never used the word *baptizo* in a *religious sense*; the Jews never used it in any other than a religious sense. The only way satisfactorily to determine the meaning of the word, is to examine into its use amongst the Jews, as applied to their religious washings, and by their inspired writers, previous to the time, and at the time our Saviour appropriated it to the ordinance of baptism."

The Biblical Repository, for April, 1840, has an article on *The Bible and its Literature*, by Prof. E. Robinson. In this article, he says, "The language of the New Testament is *the latter Greek, as spoken by foreigners of the Hebrew stock, and applied by them to subjects on which it has never been employed by native Greeks*. After the dis-

use of the ancient Hebrew in Palestine, and the irruption of western conquerors, the Jews adopted the Greek language from necessity ; partly as a conquered people, and partly from intercourse of life and commerce, in colonies, in cities, founded like Alexandria and others, which were peopled with throngs of Jews. It was, therefore, the spoken language of ordinary life which they learned, not the classic style of books which elsewhere come down to us. But they spake it as foreigners, whose native tongue was the later Armenian ; and it, therefore, could not fail to acquire from their lips a strong Semitic character and coloring. When to this we add, that they spake in Greek *on the things of the true God, and the relations of mankind to Jehovah and to a Saviour — subjects, to which no native Greek had ever applied his beautiful language*, it will be obvious that an APPEAL merely to classic Greek and its philology, WILL NOT SUFFICE for the interpretation of the New Testament. The Jewish Greek must be studied almost as an independent dialect." &c.

" This change of meaning in many words of the Greek language, upon adapting it to the idiom and observance of revealed religion, was a matter of *necessity* : and that aside from the natural influence of the Hebraic idiom. It prevailed very gradually ; its genius received a mould from the genius of the Hebrew. Greek words were applied to Jewish ideas, and to ideas which had never been compounded into an existence in the land of classic Greek : as in the words translated holy, holiness, sin, faith, repentance, justification, salvation. Carry the gospel to China or Hindostan, or among the tribes of our American Indians, it brings them a multitude of ideas which are peculiar to revealed religion. To express these ideas, the old words of their language must receive a new meaning, or they must coin new words — or they must adopt words from the language of those

who brought them the new religion, or from some other quarter. \* \* \*

"The sole intent of all this discussion about the classic use and the New Testament use, is to show that the word baptize in the New Testament, *may have left its primary classic signification and have received a GENERIC SACRED USE, equivalent to WASHING or PURIFYING, without the least reference to the mode in which that 'washing of water' is performed.* Whether this be the fact or not, is to be learned not from the Greek classics, but from the New Testament itself. As to the matter of fact, Mark, and Luke, and Paul are better witnesses concerning what they themselves understood by the word baptize, than Xenophon, Aristotle, or than even that Hebrew of the Hebrews, the Jewish Josephus, when he is using the word in the sense of the Greek classics, with no reference to its use as applied to a religious ordinance.

"Will any Baptist make an issue on this point, and maintain that Apostles and Evangelists are not to be heard in evidence? Will any Baptist maintain that Evangelists and Apostles may not explain their own meaning in just the same way that heathen Greeks may explain theirs? Will any Baptist maintain, that when the testimony of the New Testament writers differs from that of the heathen Greeks, the New Testament witness is not to be heard before any heathen and before all the heathen classics together? In fine, the question here is, 'is the Holy Ghost a competent and credible witness' as to the sense in which the Holy Ghost uses the word *baptize.*' Dr. Hall, pp. 99, 100.

With all due respect for our Baptist brethren, I humbly conceive that, in this matter, they have fallen into an egregious error, in their attempted correction of our common translation.

To the Bibles and Testaments issued by their society,

they prefix a glossary, containing among others, the following words, thus :

*“Meaning of the words used in the translation.*

AGGELOS, Angel, Messenger.

BAPTIZO, Baptize, Immerse.

BAPTISMOS, Baptism, Immersion.

EKKLESIA, Church, Congregation.

“It is maintained that those words, and some others, are improperly, if not dishonestly, left *untranslated*, and that the words which are given in the third column as the meaning ought to be substituted for the words adopted in our translation. Thus when we read ‘Church,’ we ought to read ‘Congregation,’ when we read ‘Angel’ in our version, we ought to read ‘Messenger ;’ when we read ‘Baptize,’ we ought to use ‘Immerse,’ and when we read ‘Baptism,’ we ought to read ‘Immersion.’” Dr. Hall, pp. 15, 16.

“The word *pneuma* (spirit) for instance, in the most ancient Greek, meant *wind* or *breath*, and nothing further. But in adapting this word to express the ideas of revealed religion, the sacred writers use it to signify *spirit*, as the spirit of man and the Spirit of God.

“The word *aggelos*, (angel,) in the heathen Greek, signified simply a *messenger*, a *person by whom news is conveyed*; and the idea of a *spiritual messenger* from God, called *aggelos*, was unknown to the Greek language. But the sacred writers appropriated this word almost exclusively to the expression of this idea. It means in the Bible what it did not mean in ancient Greek : a *spiritual messenger and servant of God*.

“The Baptists then, if they would be consistent with themselves, in claiming a literal translation of *baptizo*, according to heathen or secular meaning, must do the same in respect to the words *pneuma* and *aggelos*. But if

they do this, they must read the passage, John iii, 5. ‘Except a man be born of water and of *the wind* (the Spirit) he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;’ and John iii, 6, ‘That which is born of *the wind* is *wind*.’ And they must make the sacred writer declare, Acts iii, 8, that the Sadducees say, ‘There is no resurrection, neither *messenger* nor *wind*.’ The same absurdity would occur from the carrying out of this principle in respect to many other Greek words, used in the New Testament, to express the peculiar ideas of revealed religion.”\* Dr. Peters.

#### § 8. TRANSLATING THE WORD BAPTIZO.

“ Our English translators employed the words *baptize* and *baptism*, which have been for ages in common use, to denote the ordinance, and which had become vernacular in the English tongue. Of Greek origin the words undoubtedly were, but they were as well understood as the words *geography*, *astronomy*, *biography*, *rhetoric*, *grammar*, and *history*, are now; which are as truly of Greek original, and as purely Greek, as the words *baptize* and *baptism*.

\* \* \* \* \* The word *immerse* is as purely Latin as *baptize* is Greek, and could not have been better understood than the word *baptize*. *Baptize* became an English word as soon as the Gospel was preached in England; and our Baptist brethren contend that *baptism* was then performed by immersion. Had this been the case, and had the old Britons been taught to consider immersion the essence of *baptism*, the word *baptism* in their language

\* Let it be observed, we do not affirm that the New Testament writers always used the words referred to in the religious sense. When they speak of ordinary things in the Greek language, they give to its words the meaning which they had in common use, before they were appropriated to the expression of religious ideas. So our Saviour, in the same conversation in which He used *pneuma* to signify spirit made use of the same word in its primitive sense, John iii, 8, “The wind (*pneuma*) bloweth where it listeth.” Dr. Peters, pp. 25, 27.

would have signified immersion; and the Greek word *baptizo* would have as truly expressed the idea as the Latin word immerse. \* \* \* The word was, indeed, originally *translated* into our language; but our English translators did not make the transfer; they gave a proper translation—employing the *very word* that had been exclusively employed to denote the ordinance, ever since the day that the Christian religion was first planted in their native land. Baptize was then as much an English word as almost any word in the English language, most of the words having been as much derived from a foreign source as the word baptize. And it would still be as well understood as any other word, were it not, that ‘a controversy exists as to its meaning in the original,’ so that the natural operation of the association of ideas has been, and still is, interrupted. Let the controversy cease—let all think correctly as to the import of the Greek words, and baptize and baptism will soon become as significant as catechise and catechism, or exorcise and exorcism, or even as immerse and immersion.’’

But neither the words, immerse, sprinkle, pour, nor any other word that relates merely to the *mode* of the ordinance, could express the idea of baptism. Baptism is a *sacred rite* of peculiar signification and design. Whatever be the *mode* of performing it, such a *mode* of applying water may be a very familiar thing with any people on earth. \* \* \* We cannot, therefore, claim that the word baptize is equivalent to the word sprinkle: and do not consider the word sprinkle or the word pour as a proper translation of the word baptize. No word which expresses simply a *mode* of applying water can fill up the idea of the word *baptizo*, and any word which *limits* the application to any *one mode*, is an arrant perversion of the Scriptures: which expressly speak of baptism under two modes, sprinkling and pouring; and refer to it again and

again under the general idea of a *purifying*, or a *washing*. The mode immerse, is the very one which finds the least countenance in the Word of God: if, indeed, there is any unquestionable authority for that mode, aside from its being *one* of the modes of washing or purifying.

"In translating the word baptizo, therefore, we must have a word which possesses two qualities. 1st. It must denote a *sacred application* of water in a ritual purifying. 2d. It must not limit the application to any one mode. To *wash* or to *purify*, comes nearer the true idea, than either the words *sprinkle* or *immerse*; and they are the *only* words which can be employed with exclusive reference to a *mode* of baptizing, consistently with the Bible. Yet, neither *wash* nor *purify*, has the exact and full signification, by the common acceptance of the terms. To *wash* did not originally, in our language, mean a *ritual purification*, much less did *immerse* have that meaning; and to *purify* does not in the common use of our language, signify necessarily an application of water. We may use them, with a modification of their common meaning; and the connection will show in what sense they are used. But after all, when the new idea of baptism came into the minds of the old Britons, they needed either a new word, or a new adaptation of an old word to express that idea. They wanted a term which should express a *ritual purifying by some manner of sacred application of water*: and it mattered not what word they employed, nor from what source it was derived, provided they might agree respecting what word should express the idea." Dr. Hall, pp. 117-121.

Here it may be added, that our venerable translators, in transferring the Greek word baptizo into the English Bible, followed the example of Jerome and the Latin translators of the Vulgate—the Latin version of the scriptures—which was completed A. D. 405, and is the

one which has been in use in the Latin Church ever since ; and is held in great veneration as a faithful version of the scriptures, by the learned of all nations.

" And there are certain advantages," says Pres. Beecher, p. 123, " in not translating, but in transferring the word. All will know that BAPTISM means A SACRED PURIFICATION or CLEANSING, and that BAPTIZE means TO PURIFY OR CLEANSE. Sacred purification will then have in all languages, one and the same sacred name. This, like John and Christ, will be known and read of all men, in all languages, as denoting either an *external* sacred purification, or that one sacred purification of *the Spirit* which it symbolizes, and which is by the Apostle associated with one Lord and one faith.

" But if the word baptize is to be translated and not transferred, it should by all means be translated PURIFY\* and not IMMERSE. To translate it immerse, is but to perpetuate error and sectarianism, by a false translation of the Word of God."

#### § 9. TRANSFERRING PECULIAR WORDS FROM ONE LANGUAGE TO ANOTHER.

Pres. Beecher says, " That to transfer words from one language to another, is not to mistranslate, but simply to take a word from the stores of one language, and by it to enrich those of another. The sense of such a word is to be fixed, as is the sense of all other words, by the application of ideas." I am so well pleased with Dr. E. Hall's article upon this subject, that I have transferred it entire to my own pages.

He says, pp. 122-125, " This transferring of words from one language to another, is not so uncommon a process as many of our brethren seem to suppose it. What

\* Yet purify in our language, would not be a perfect translation of the word *baptizo*, because purify with us, has no exclusive sacred meaning.

English word shall be substituted for the Greek word ‘Tetrarch,’ Luke iii, 1? What for the Greek word ‘Pentecost,’ in Acts ii, 1? What for the Greek words ‘Christ’ and ‘Christians’? ‘Christ’ signifies *anointed*, and so does the Hebrew ‘Messiah.’ But to *translate* the word, in a cases, on the principle contended for by our Baptist brethren, would confound and destroy the meaning of many passages of scripture. The word is applied by way of eminence, as an APPELLATION, to the promised Redeemer. In Matt. i, 1-18, and Mark i, as often elsewhere, our Lord is called, not ‘Jesus THE Christ.’ As George Campbell says, D. V., Part 4, ‘Though the word ‘anoint’ expressed the primitive import of the Hebrew name, it does not convey the idea, *in which it was then universally understood*. It was understood solely as the well-known title of an extraordinary office, to which there was nothing similar among the people.’ That the word ‘Christ’ has this peculiar meaning when applied to the Saviour may be seen at once, by applying the word in its English sense, to other personages, who are often spoken of by the same original words, both in Hebrew and Greek. How would it sound to hear David speaking of Saul, as in 1 Samuel xxiv, 6, and repeatedly call that wicked king the ‘*Christ* of the Lord?’ How would it sound, in Isa. xliv, 1, to hear the Lord speaking to Cyrus, as to his ‘Christ’? or, in Psalm cv, ‘Teach not my Christ!’ Here the same as imperatively demands that the word be translated according to its original import, as other passages do, that it should not be translated, but transferred.

“I suppose it would be lawful to talk to the Hindoos or the Burmans, about the Jewish ‘Synagogues,’ though that too, is a word of Greek origin. If any heathen have no term for such beings as *devils*, I suppose it would be lawful to introduce to them such words as the Greek ‘Diabolos,’ or the English word *devil*. It would be a

matter of indifference whether you introduce to them our Hebraic English word ‘ Sabbath,’ and teach them its meaning ; or teach them how to use one of their own old words with a new meaning. The volume of God’s Word might retain its Greek English name *Bible*, or it might be turned into the words vernacular among the heathen for ‘ Writings’ or for ‘ The Book ;’ only teaching them to give a new idea to their common words. Such words as ‘ Jubilee,’ ‘ ho-  
mer,’ ‘ ephah,’ ‘ shekel,’ ‘ cherubim,’ might be transferred, or old words selected, and taught to bear a meaning not originally their own, as should be found most convenient. A scholar, dealing in profane literature only, in translating from the ancient Greek writers, or from Cicero or Tacitus, might find himself compelled, either to give erroneous ideas, or to *transfer* into Burmese, or Japanese, such words as ‘ Archon,’ ‘ Consul,’ ‘ Pretor,’ ‘ Questor,’ ‘ Censor,’ ‘ Senator,’ ‘ Dictator,’ ‘ Tribune.’ ‘ Who,’ says Campbell, ‘ consider their names,’ (as transferred into our language,) ‘ as barbarous ? ’ ‘ To have employed instead of them, ‘ Alderman,’ ‘ Sheriff,’ &c., we should have justly thought much more explicable.’ ‘ I have heard’ says he, ‘ of a Dutch translator of Cesar’s Commentaries, who always rendered *Consul*, *Burgomaster*; and in the same taste, all the other officers and magistrates of Rome.’ How could we have translated the Latin classics, and given the true idea, unless we had *naturalized* in such cases the very Latin words, and learned the ideas and the names together ? Where would have been our English ideas of such a thing as a ‘ libation,’ an ‘ ovation,’ a ‘ lustration,’ had we not imported, not only the names, but the very ideas, from the language and customs of heathenism ? Whence comes our English word ‘ triumph ? ’ Whence comes the new English words ‘ Sultan,’ ‘ Pacha,’ ‘ Khan,’ ‘ Bey ? ’ What limit is there to the transferring of the very words of the people who bring

us new things and new ideas? Look at our military terms—almost all are adopted and transferred from the *French*. Look at our terms of chemistry, botany, and zoology: how many of them have been recently compounded from the Greek.

"Now, unless baptism is already in use among the heathens as a RELIGIOUS PURIFICATION, and expressed by a word of their own, *having this precise idea* in distinction from the idea of any simple *mode* of administering water, or, at least, in *addition* to such an idea of mode, it must be as inadequate and inaccurate a translation which shall use an old word of theirs, referring simply to the mode of applying water, as it would be to turn the Roman Consul into a Dutch Burgomaster. The translation is inadequate, it is incorrect, it misleads, and that aside from the consideration that to translate *baptizo*, *immerse*, makes the Bible speak falsehood, even with regard to the mere mode. You may transfer the word *baptizo*—you may call baptism, in Siamese, (as the Baptist Bible Society say our Missionaries have done,) 'Baptecsamay,' conforming the shape of the word to the genius of the language, as in the Latin *baptizare* and the Engiish *baptize*, and it is correct. It is as easy to teach them the new word as it is to teach them the new idea—the positive and peculiar scripture idea of baptize. Or you may translate *baptizo* into a word signifying to *wash*; still, better if you can find a word which signifies a *ritual purifying by washing*; and you have given a most faithful translation. But to translate the word by the word *immerse*, is to give an inadequate, inaccurate, and we contend a *false idea*."

Dr. Peters, in a note, p. 33, says, "I do not mean to affirm that there was no reason for the selection of *baptizo* to denote Christian Baptism, rather than any other Greek word. There is an analogy between its primitive meaning and its religious meaning, which was a good reason for

its selection. But since it has been appropriated to this specific use, we are to learn its new meaning, not from that analogy, but from the thing which it now signifies.

### § 10. THE IMPORT OF BAPTO, THE Root.

Baptizo is the word chosen by the Holy Ghost to symbolize *spiritual purification*. It is the principal derivative from *bapto* the root ; and we come now, in the course of this investigation, directly to the definition of these terms. It is usual in discussions upon the subject of baptism, to define the root *bapto*, and an argument is not considered complete without it. From the fact, that our Baptist brethren formerly took the ground, that *bapto* means to dip or immerse, *alone*, as its primitive and literal meaning, and that any other shade of meaning, still further from that of immerse, is tropical or figurative. But the more intelligent Baptists have now abandoned that exclusive ground, and admit that, by an extension of the literal sense, *bapto* means to *dip, color, stain, dye, wet*, etc., so that what may be said under this section would be a work of supererogation, were it considered necessary to render the argument complete. For all that is gained to the cause of truth, in this part of the investigation, is this, if we are able to show that *bapto* the root, so far departs from its original primary meaning of *dip*, as to include the idea of dying, tinging, moistening, smearing, and even sprinkling ; and that by an *extension* of its *literal* meaning, it irresistibly furnishes an argument, that *baptizo*, the derivation, is also capable of a similar extension and departure from its primitive meaning to immerse.

The word *bapto* occurs in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament *four times*, and in the New Testament\*

\* *Bapto* occurs in Luke xvi, 24, John xiii, 26, and Rev. xix, 13 : and the compound verb *embapto* occurs in Matt. xxvi, 23, Mark xiv, 20, and John xiii, 26.

*six times;*,<sup>7</sup> and it is invariably rendered dip by our English translators, in every instance except one, with the idea of a *partial immersion* or *dipping*; and is never employed in a religious sense, but always in its original classical meaning. It occurs in Dan. iv, 33, where Nebuchadnezzar was driven from the society of men, and his “body was *wet* with the dew of heaven.” Here *bapto* is rendered *wet*; and there could be no possible immersion in water, for it was with the dew of heaven. And in Rev. xix, 13, it also occurs in its participial form; “And He was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood.” Origen, one of the Greek fathers, who lived in the third century, and was one of the brightest scholars of the age, and, of course, well acquainted with his native tongue; in preparing a copy of the scriptures, substituted *rantizo* to *sprinkle* for *bapto* to *dip*, in this passage. Hence it reads, “And He was clothed with a garment *sprinkled* with blood.” I will just add, the Latin Vulgate, the Syrian, and the Ethiopic version, all translate *bapto* in this text, by the word *sprinkle*, in their respective languages; and so does Prof. Stuart also, in his work on the Apocalypse.

Now let us examine the definitions of some of the ablest lexicographers, as they occur in the published debate between Rice and Campbell, p. 68, omitting the Latin.

*Hendricus* defines it, “To immerse, to plunge, to dye, to wash,” &c.

*Scapula*,—“To immerse, to plunge; also, to stain, dye, color—also, to wash.”

*Coulon*,—“To dye, to cleanse.”

*Ursinus*,—“To dip, to dye, to wash, sprinkle.”

*Schrivellius*,—“To dip, to dye, to wash, to draw water.”

*Groves*,—“To dip, plunge, immerse, to wash, to wet, moisten, *sprinkle*, to steep, imbue, to dye.” &c.

*Donnnegan*,—“To dip, to plunge into water, to submerge, to wash, to dye, to color.” &c.

The lexicons, observe, not only define the word *bapto*, to dip, plunge, dye, but also, to *wash*. Now, every one at all acquainted with language, knows, that *wash* as well as cleanse, dye, color, is an open term, and never expresses *mode*, and may be performed by different modes of application. Scapula defines this word not only to dip, dye, &c.; but also to *wash*, (in any mode,) and he is one of the best authorities. Groves goes even further, and defines it to *wash*, and also to *wet*; and not only to wet, but also to *moisten*; and not only to moisten, but also to *sprinkle*. Even Dr. Carson, the great Baptist critic, admits, that it does *not* always express mode. Hear him, p. 62, "A word may come to enlarge its meaning, so as to lose sight of its origin. This fact must be obvious to every smatterer in philology. Had it been attended to, Baptists would have found no necessity to prove that *bapto*, when it signifies to dye, always signifies to dye by *dipping*; and their opponents would have seen no advantage from proving that it signifies *dying in any manner*. Again, "Bapto signifies to dye by *sprinkling*, as properly as by *dipping*; though originally it was confined to the latter." Again, "Nor are such applications of the word to be accounted for by metaphor as Dr. Gale asserts. They are as literal as the primary meaning. It is by extension of the literal meaning, and not by figure of any kind, that words come to depart so far from their original signification. The word *bapto*, therefore, not only expresses the application of a fluid by *sprinkling*, but this is a literal signification."

I will next illustrate the simple process by which words pass from one meaning to another, by a quotation from Pres. Beecher. His illustration is so apposite that I cannot forego transcribing it. He says, p. 11, "The verb *to spring*, denotes an act, and gives rise to a noun also denoting an act. A perception of similitude transfers the word to the issuing of water from a fountain— to the

motion of a watch-spring—and to the springing of plants in the spring season of the year. Yet, who does not feel that to be able to trace such a process of thought, is far from proving that when a man in one place says, I made a *spring* over the ditch, in another, I broke the *spring* of my watch, in another, I drank from the *spring*, in another, I prefer *spring* to winter, he means in each case the same thing by the word *spring*? And when in using these words, always resort to the original idea of the verb? Indeed, so far is it from being true that this is commonly done, that most persons are pleased when the track of the mind is uncovered, and the path is pointed out by which it had passed from meaning to meaning, as if a new idea had been acquired. So *conversation*, *prevent*, *charity*, as now used, have obviously departed widely from the sense in which they were used in the days of the translators of the Bible." "So the words *bind* and *bonds* originally meant to tie up or manacle with cords or chains. But who thinks now of putting cords or fetters on a man when he is *bound* to keep the peace or to appear in court; or when he is put under *bonds* to fill the condition of a bargain or agreement." See the subject fully illustrated under Sec. 12.

### § 11. IMPORT OF THE WORD BAPTIZO.

We have now reached, in the course of this discussion, the definition of the word *baptizo*. This word occurs several times in the Septuagint, but is not employed in a single instance in that version, in its real given sense. It occurs in the New Testament,—in some shape or other, more than one hundred times, and is not translated into our English version but three times; but is merely transferred, as we have already seen, with the English translation *ize* and *ism*, to suit the genius of our language. It is

translated in Mark vii, 4, 8 ; Luke xi, 38, and Heb. ix, 10, by our English word *wash*; but in these instances, there is no reference whatever to the ordinance of baptism, but to the legal or ceremonial purification of the Mosaic dispensation. And, although we take the ground that, when employed to denote the ordinance of baptism, it is to be understood in a sense peculiar to that rite; still, we admit, that there is an analogy existing between the sacred and profane use of the term *baptizo*; and on that account, and also to render the argument complete, we will refer the reader to the definitions of the word, as is customary. To do which, I will recur to the lexicographers and the definitions adduced by Dr. Rice, in his discussion with A. Campbell, *Debate pp. 69, 70*, omitting the Latin as before. *Scapula* defines the word *baptizo*, “To dip or immerse—

also, to dye ; as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing them ; also, to plunge, submerge, to cover with water ; also to *cleanse* to *wash*.”

*Hendricus*,—1. “To dip, immerse, to cover with water ; 2. to *cleanse* to *wash* ; 3. to baptize in a sacred sense.”

*Stephenus*,—“To dip, immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing ; to merge, submerge, to cover with water—to *cleanse* to *wash*.”

*Schleusner*,—“Not only to plunge, immerse, but to *cleanse*, *wash*, to *purify* with water.”

*Parkhurst*,—“To immerse in, or *wash with* water in token of purification.”

*Robinson*,—“To immerse, to sink ; for example, spoken of ships, galleys, &c. In the New Testament to *wash*, to *cleanse by washing*—to wash one’s self, to bathe, perform ablution,” &c.

*Schrivellius*,—“To baptize, immerse, to *cleanse*, to *wash*.”

*Groves*,—“To dip, immerse, inmerge, plunge, to *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*—*Baptizomai*, to wash one’s self, bathe,” &c.

*Bretschneider*,—“ Properly, often to dip, often to *wash*; then, 1. simply to *wash*, to *cleanse*; in the middle voice, I *wash* or *cleanse* myself.”

*Suidar*, — “ To sink, plunge, immerse; to *wet*, *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*,” &c.

*Wahl*, — 1. “ To *wash*, to *perform ablution*, *cleanse*; 2. to immerse.”

*Greenfield*, — “ To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in New Testament, to *wash*, perform ablution, *cleanse*, to immerse.”

Dr. Rice very pertinently remarks, “ I have now adduced the principal lexicons, ancient and modern; and it is a fact, that with remarkable unanimity, they testify that the word *baptizo* signifies, not only to sink, dip, plunge, &c., but also, to *wash*, to *cleanse*, to *purify*. Scapula, the learned lexicographer, to whom Mr. Campbell appealed with so much confidence, defines it, not only to dip, plunge, &c., but to *wash*, to *cleanse*; and mark the fact, he refers to the New Testament as the place in which we find the word used in the sense of washing and cleansing. Now, every one at all acquainted with language, knows that the words *wash* and *cleanse* do not express *mode*. They signify washing and cleansing in any mode.

“ Let me here distinctly remark, that I am not contending that the word *baptizo*, definitely expresses pouring or sprinkling. I maintain, that as used in the scriptures, it expresses the thing *done* — the application of water to a subject, but not the *mode* of doing it; that the mode in which baptism was administered cannot be determined by the word, but must be learned from the connection and circumstances, or from other sources.

“ Hendricus defines the word — first, to immerse or plunge, and secondly, to *wash*, *cleanse*, without reference to mode. Schleusner, besides the definition to plunge, &c., gives three others which express the thing *done*, but not

the mode of doing it: viz., to *cleanse*, to *wash*, to *purify* with water. Parkhurst makes it mean either to immerse in, or to *wash with* water. Robinson, one of the first lexicographers, first gives the definition to immerse, to sink, &c., but in the *New Testament*, the first meaning he finds is to *wash*, to *cleanse by washing*, to *perform ablution*. Bretschneider gives as the general meaning of *baptizo*, properly, often to *dip*, often to *wash*—thus putting these two definitions upon a perfect equality with each other. His is a lexicon of the New Testament, and the first meaning he there finds, is, *simply to wash, to cleanse*. Here certainly, is no immersing. \* \* \* Suidar, one of the ablest Lexicographers we have seen, defines it, not only to plunge, sink, &c., but to *wet, wash, cleanse*, &c.; and every one knows that a thing may be *wetted, washed, or cleansed* without being immersed. Greenfield defines it, as you see, to sink, to wash," &c.

"Let the facts now established be remembered: viz., that the words *bapto* and *baptizo*, have several meanings—that they are used sometimes in the sense of dipping, plunging, sinking; sometimes in the sense of washing, cleansing, purifying; sometimes in the sense of pouring, sprinkling. In the classics, I can prove, that four times in five *baptizo* expresses *sinking to the bottom*. Let it be remembered, too, that the lexicons refer to the Bible for the use of *baptizo* in the general sense of *washing, cleansing,*" &c.

"I do not, however, maintain that the mode in which baptism is to be administered is *unimportant*, though I do contend that it is *not essential*. But, though *baptizo* does not definitely express the mode, it may be learned from the design of the ordinance, and from the circumstances attending the administration of it; and those evidences are decidedly in favor of pouring or sprinkling."

I will merely add here, that, from the above catalogue

of definitions, it is evident, that the word *baptizo*, in its classical usage, embraces a wide compass of meaning. It is capable of a variety of significations, ranging through every shade of meaning, from a complete *submersion in water*, to a mere *sprinkling* or *wetting with water*; and that not by metaphor, as some contend, but extension of its literal meaning; that the New Testament use of the word corresponds in general, with what the lexicons give as the secondary meaning of the term: viz., that of *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*; that it corresponds as nearly as possible with the idea of the *sacred ritual purification* of the Old Testament, and as such is synonymous with the Greek word *katharizo*, (to purify,) in the Septuagint, and that it is strictly generic, and may be performed by any mode of application.

I will close this section in the language of Pres. Beecher, somewhat abridged, pp. 8-11. "The position which I shall endeavor to prove by appeal to facts, is this, that the word *baptizo* as a religious term, means neither dip nor sprinkle, immerse nor pour, nor any other external action in applying a fluid to the body, or the body to the fluid—nor any action which is limited to our mode of performance; but that as a religious term, it means at all times, to purify or cleanse—words of a meaning so general as not to be confined to any mode, or agent, or means, or object, whether material or spiritual, but to leave the widest scope for the question as to mode—so that, in their usage, it is in every respect a perfect synonym of the word *katharizo*.

"Let it then be borne in mind, that the question is not this—does the word in all its extent of usage denote *at any time* a definite external act? Nor this—is this its *original*, primitive signification? Even if all this were admitted, it would not touch the question—for, as we all know, nothing is more common than for words to be used in

more meanings than one, and to decide in what sense a word is used in a given instance, we are not to follow etymology or fancy, but evidence, derived from the facts of the case.

"With regard then to the other uses of the word *baptizo*, I freely admit that in classic usage, it does, as a general fact, clearly denote some external act of a specific kind, yet it is by no means clear to my mind that it does not in different cases denote different acts.

1. "I freely admit, that in numerous cases, it clearly denotes to immerse,—in which an agent submerges partially or totally some person or thing.

2. "It is also applied to cases where a fluid without an agent rolls over, or floods, and covers anything—as the river overflowing its banks, and intercepting and overwhelming land animals; and as the seashore is baptizèd and overwhelmed by the tide.

3. "It is also applied in cases where some person or thing sinks passively into the flood. Thus Josephus, in narrating his shipwreck in the Adriatic, uses this word to describe the sinking of the ship.

"I am fully aware that by some writers vigorous efforts are made to reduce all these senses to the original idea to immerse or dip. But it seems to me that they are rather led by their zeal to support a theory, than by a careful induction from facts; and that they wrest facts to suit their principles, rather than derive their principles from facts. \* \* \*

"To all this, however, I attach no great importance in the discussion of the present question, unless it be of use in exposing the fallacy of all efforts to reduce this word to such a perfect simplicity of meaning, even as it regards an external act, as is claimed for it by some.

"On the other hand, even if I were to admit that its original and primitive idea was to immerse, and that

when it denotes an external act, it never departs from this sense ; still the question would arise, Is there not another meaning derived from the effects of this act, and in which the mind contemplates the effect alone, entirely irrespective of the mode in which it is produced ?

“ I contend that there is — and that as thorough cleansing or purification is often the result of submersion in water, so the word *baptize* has come to signify to cleanse or purify thoroughly, without any reference to the mode in which it is done.”

## § 12. THE PROCESS BY WHICH WORDS PASS FROM ONE MEANING TO ANOTHER.

“ It may at first sight seem an improbable position to some, that if a word originally signifies “ to immerse,” it can assume a meaning so remote from its primitive sense as “ *to purify*,” and entirely drop all reference to the mode. Yet the slightest attention to the laws of the mind and of language, and to well known facts, will show that not the least improbability of such a result exists.

“ No principle is more universally admitted by all sound philologists, than that to establish the original and primitive meaning of a word, is not at all decisive as it regards its subsequent usage. It often aids only as giving a clue by which we can trace the progress of the imagination, or the association of ideas, in leading the mind from meaning to meaning, on some ground of relation, similitude, or connection of cause and effect.” \* \* \* “ To establish such secondary meanings, it is not necessary that we should be able to trace the course of the mind, though it is pleasant to be able to do it. A secondary meaning, however unlike it may seem to the primitive, may yet be established like any other fact in the usage of language, that is, by appropriate testimony.

“ But whilst such transitions are common in all words.

they are particularly common in words of the class of *baptizo*, denoting action by, or with reference to, a fluid. This is owing to the fact, that the effects produced by the action, depend not on the action alone, but on the action and the fluid combined — and of course may be varied as the fluid or its application varies.” \* \* \* “ Now as a matter of fact, such transfers have taken place in cognate, and similar words,

“ I shall out of many select a few cases from Greek, Latin, and English words, fully to illustrate, and clearly to confirm these principles, and to show that they are peculiar to no language, but rest on universal laws of the mind.

“ In Greek, all admit that the most common sense of *batpto* is to dip, to immerse. I am willing to admit that it is the primitive sense. But it is beyond all dispute that the same word has passed to the meaning to dye, without any reference to mode. Great efforts were once made to deny this. But the most intelligent Baptists now entirely abandon this ground, and that with the best reason. And indeed, so far has the word passed from its original sense, that it is applied to coloring the surface of an object by gold, *i. e.* by gilding. A few examples out of many, in so plain a case, must suffice. In the battle of the frogs and mice, a mouse is represented as *dyeing* or *coloring* the lake with his blood.

“ Hippocrates employs it to denote dyeing by dropping the dyeing liquid on the thing dyed. When it *drops* upon the garments, they are *dyed* (*baptetai*). This surely is not dyeing by dipping.” — (*Carson*, p. 44.)

“ Again. In Arian—Expedition of Alexander : ‘ Nearchus relates that the Indian *dye*, (*baptontai*) their beards : It will not be contended that they *dyed* their beards by immersion.’ (p. 44.)

“ Carson quotes cases in which it is used to describe

the *coloring* of the hair : the *staining* of a garment by blood ; the *staining* the hands by crushing a coloring substance in it ; for which, and other of like kind, I refer to him, and to Prof. Stuart.'

" It is compounded with colors of all kinds, as of a purple or hyacinth dye. It denotes a *dyer*, a *dyeing vat*, a *dye-house*, etc., and it even passes, as before stated, to cases in which a new color is produced by the external application of a solid, as *colored with gold*, or *gilded*. But it is needless to quote at large all the examples which might be adduced to illustrate and confirm these points. I shall therefore proceed to consider the usages of a kindred word in the Latin language.

" *Tingo*, beyond all doubt, means to immerse. In this sense Facciolatus and Forcellinus in their *Totius Latinitatis lexicon*, give *bapto* as its synonym. And as *bapto* is used to describe the immersing of an ax to temper it, so is *tingo* to describe similar operations. So Virgil, speaking of the operation of the Cyclopean workmen of Vulcan, thus describes them as immersing their hissing metals in water to temper them. They *dip* (*tingunt*) the hissing brass in the lake : so speaking of a sword. He had *dipped* (*tinxerat*) the sword in Stygian water. Celsus speaks of sponges *dipped* (*tineta*) in vinegar.

" The setting of the heavenly bodies is spoken of as an immersion in the sea, and to describe this *tingo* is used : —Virg. Georg. 'The winter suns haste to *dip* (*tingere*) themselves in the ocean.' Phœbus *dips* (*tingat*) his horses in the deep.

" But to prove that it means immerse is needless ; no one can deny it, nor is it the point at which I chiefly aim. This is, that like *bapto*, it loses all reference to the act of immersion, and comes to signify simply to *dye* or *color in any way*. \* \* \* But there is direct proof in the Latin Classics of the same kind as exists with respect to *bapto*.

" Horace uses the word to denote the *dyeing* (*tingere*) of wool; Ovid, to denote the *coloring* of hair and of ivory; Horace, to denote the *coloring* (*tinget*) of the ax used in sacrificing the victims; Virgil, to denote the malignant effects of a plague on cattle, mentions that they had scarce blood enough left to *color* (*tingunter*) the knives used to slay them. Indeed, on this word no less than on *bapto*, we have the unequivocal concession of Dr. Carson, that it means to dye. 'In Latin also, the same word, *tingo*, signifies both to *dip*, and to *dye*.' — *Carson*, page 54.

" In English, for the sake of contrast, I shall select the word to *wash*. The original and common idea of this word is undeniably to cleanse by a purifying fluid, as water—and that, without respect to mode. Of these ideas in its progress it drops all, and assumes a meaning that involves neither to purify, nor to use a fluid at all. As washing is often performed by a superficial application of a fluid, it often assumes this sense, and loses entirely the idea of cleansing, as when we speak of washing a wound with brandy; or with some cooling application, to alleviate inflammation. In this case we aim not at cleansing, but at medicinal effect. So we can speak of the sea as washing the shore or rocks, denoting not cleansing, but the copious superficial application of a fluid. Again, as a superficial application of a fluid or a coloring mixture, is often made for the sake of changing the color, we have to *white-wash*, to *red-wash*, to *yellow-wash*; and the substances or fluid mixtures with which this is done, are called *washes*.

" Next it drops the idea of a fluid at all, and assumes the sense of a superficial application of a solid—as to *wash* with silver or gold. And here a remarkable coincidence in result, of words in meaning originally unlike, deserves notice, as a striking illustration of the progress

of the mind in effecting such changes. In Greek, *bapto* originally denotes to immerse—action alone, without reference to effect. In English, wash denotes to cleanse or purify alone, without reference to mode. Yet, by the operation of the laws of association, both are used to denote coloring, and both to denote covering superficially with silver or gold. Finally, when we speak of the *wash* of a cow-yard, and call those places where deposits of earth or filth, or vegetable matter, are made, *washes*, who will contend that the idea to purity is still retained? \* \*

" Now with such facts before us, to increase the number indefinitely, were perfectly easy, who can say that there is the slightest improbability in the idea that the word *baptizo* should pass from the sense to immerse, to the sense to purify, without reference to the mode? Can *bapto*, *tingo*, and *wash*, pass through similar transitions, and cannot *baptizo*?

" But what secondary sense shall be adopted, cannot be told *a priori*, but must be decided by the habits, manners, customs, and general ideas of a people, and sometimes by peculiar usages for which no reason can be given. For example, no reason exists in the nature of things, why *bapto* rather than *baptizo* should pass from the sense immerse to the sense to dye, yet there is evidence that it did. On the other hand, it could not be certainly foretold that *baptizo* rather than *bapto* would pass to the sense to cleanse and yet that it did pass may still be true, and if true, can be proved like any other fact." \* \* \*

" Circumstances did exist tending to produce such a transfer of meaning in *baptizo*, and therefore, there is a strong probability that it was made. As it regards *bapto* and *tingo*, we have no proof that any peculiar cause existed tending to such a change of meaning as they are confessed to have undergone. But as it regards *baptizo*, such a tendency can be proved to have existed in the manners and

customs of the Jews, for though no immersions of the persons were enjoined in the Mosaic ritual, but simply washings of the body, or flesh, in any way, yet there can be no doubt that immersions and bathings were in daily use—and these, as well as all their other washings, were solely for the sake of purity and held up this idea daily before the mind.

“Hence, when after the conquests of Alexander, the Greek language began to be spoken by the Jews, it encountered a tendency of the same kind as that which had already changed the meaning of *bapto* to color or dye; but far more definite, powerful, and all pervading; for the practice of immersing to color was limited to a few, but the practice of bathing or immersing to purify, was common to a whole nation. Indeed, the idea of purification from uncleanness pervades their whole ritual in numberless cases, and must have been perfectly familiar to the mind of every one.” *Abridged from Beecher, pp. 11-19.*  
See sec. 4.

## THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE IMPORT OF THE WORD BAPTIZO — THE SCRIPTURE IDEA OF BAPTISM.

HAVING now brought the philological argument and definition to a close, I most gladly dismiss it ; for, although the subject is both important and interesting to the more advanced student of theology, I fear it has been not only dry and tedious, but somewhat perplexing to plain readers, for whom the work is chiefly designed. I am pleased, therefore, to take up the Biblical argument, and examine the scriptural idea of baptism ;—the definition given by Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, and see how far it corresponds with that given by the lexicographers and classical writers ; and I flatter myself that the task will be a pleasing one, and the result altogether satisfactory.

The design of this chapter is not only to ascertain the scriptural idea of the ordinance of baptism, and definition of the word baptizo by which it is indicated, but at the same time to obtain, as far as possible, a clue to the *mode* of baptism. For, while it is a conceded fact, that the commission given by the Saviour is not a commission to immerse, or sprinkle, but simply a commission to *baptize* or *purify* the nations, leaving the performance open as to *mode* ; still it is strongly urged, that the mode of baptism is clearly indicated in the scriptures of divine truth.

And here it becomes necessary to remark, that the word katharizo or kathairo (to *purify*) is the term which is invariably employed in the Septuagint, to denote the ritual purification of the Jews, and is a perfect synonym of the word baptizo, and was constantly used interchangably with it, by the early fathers, and in some instances, by the Saviour himself.

### § 13. SACRIFICIAL SENSE OF BAPTIZO.

“Baptizo and katharizo are so similarly used in connection with the forgiveness of sins, as decidedly to favor the idea that they are in a religious sense synonymous. The purification effected by the Holy Spirit is of two kinds : 1. A purification from spiritual defilement ; 2. A deliverance from the guilt of sin, i. e. liability to be punished, and from a sense of guilt, through the atonement. It is through the atonement that pardon is given ; and through the Holy Spirit, conviction of sin is produced ; and by Him, also, a sense of guilt is taken away in view of the atonement — and in this sense He is said to cleanse from sin by the blood of Christ. This kind of purification may be called legal, as it relates to guilt, forgiveness, and atonement. The other kind of purification may be called moral, inasmuch as it removes the unholy and impure feelings and habits of the mind, and produces in their place those that are holy and pure. Both kinds of purification are expressed by the same word katharizo. Its use to denote legal purification or expiation is very extensive. It denotes 1. To make atonement. As in Ex. xxix, 37, and xxx, 10, “Thou shalt make atonement for the altar,” “Aaron shall make atonement ; Sept. katharizo.” 2. To forgive, Ex. xx, 7, “The Lord will not hold him *guiltless* (or kathariei) that taketh his name in vain.” Ex. xxiv, 7, “That will by no means *clear* the guilty.”

Deut. v, 11—*Idem.* In these and similar cases the Greek katharizo corresponds to the Hebrew word to forgive, to absolve from punishment, and is used in a sense strictly legal, and does not refer to moral purity at all. So in 1 John i, 7, “The blood of Jesus Christ His Son *cleanseth* us from all sin ;” and verse 9, “He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to *cleanse* us from all unrighteousness.” In these cases the idea of atonement and forgiveness by it, are involved in katharizo, and in Heb. the blood of Christ is said *to purge* the conscience from dead works, implying a deliverance from a sense of guilt and a sense of pardoned sin. Katharizo is here used ; hence an atonement is called katharismos in Heb. i, 3. “When He had by Himself *purged* (katharismon) our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.” In this case the atonement, (katharismos,) was made first, and then applied to cleanse by the Holy Spirit.

“ Among the Jews this kind of purification was indicated by its appropriate external forms, of which the sprinkling of blood was the most common—if not the only one. Besides this, as all know, katharizo is used abundantly to denote moral purification or its emblem, ceremonial purification—of which no examples are needed. Hence to a Jew it was natural to apply to a rite symbolizing the forgiveness of sins the term katharismos, or some synonymous word.

“ Between immersion, and the forgiveness of sins, no such associations had ever been established. For all the remissions of sin under the old ritual, were by blood, and hence Paul, Heb. ix, 19–23, after speaking of the sprinkling of blood upon the people and the book, the tabernacle and the vessels, says, “ Almost all things are by the law purified by blood, and *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.*” Here a rite denoting remission of sins, *by sprinkling of blood*, is spoken of as a katharismos,

*a purification* But under the law, the forgiveness of sins was never symbolized by an immersion of the person forgiven. Hence, if any word is used to denote a rite symbolical of the forgiveness of sins, in the same way as *katharismos*, it is probably used in the same sense. But *baptizo* and its derivatives are so used, Mark i, 4, "John preached the baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins,"—so in Luke iii, 3; also, Acts ii, 38, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

"Here is a rite symbolizing the forgiveness of sins. The common name for rites of this import is *katharismos*. *Baptizo* is used to denote the rite. Immersion had never previously been used for any such purpose. How reasonable then, the conclusion that *baptismos* has the same sense as the word, whose familiar office it performs. But though baptism in these places relates chiefly to legal purification, in others it relates as clearly to moral purification, and in this respect also corresponds with *katharizo*, which, as we have seen, includes both kinds of purification, legal and moral.

"To sum up all in a few words, *baptizo* is used in connection with both kinds of purification, legal and moral, of the conscience and the heart; and the language most commonly applied to the first is *kathairo* or *katharizo*—and this is always in the ritual symbolized by sprinkling and by blood. Hence, as *baptizo* is used in reference to the same kind of purification, with *katharizo*, and as it stands in the same relations with it to the forgiveness of sins, it is highly probable that it has the same sense. By giving it a meaning so extensive as purify, it is adapted to fulfill all its relations. By confining it to a meaning so limited as to immerse, it is unfitted for at least one-half the relations in which it stands."—*Beecher*, pages 28, 31.

§ 14. OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES — EXPECTATION THAT  
THE MESSIAH WOULD PURIFY OR BAPTIZE.

There are a number of Old Testament prophecies which contain the scripture idea of baptism, and doubtless anticipated that ordinance in all its design and significance under the gospel. The doctrine of atonement and a legal purification connected with it, pervades the whole typical economy, which looked forward to *better things*, and presented to the eye of faith a still greater purification to be effected by the promised Messiah. On this ground alone it is, that we are able to account for the existing expectation that the Messiah would baptize. (John i, 25.) That the Messiah should purify is often and clearly predicted.

1. "But especially is this foretold in that last and prominent prophecy of Malachi iii, 1-3, which was designed to fill the eye and the mind of the nation, until he came: 'Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: but who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? For he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall *purify* the sons of Levi, and *purge* them as gold and silver.'

"He is here presented to the mind in all his majesty and power, but amid all other ideas that of purifying is most prominent. He was above all things to *purify* and *purge*, and that with power so great, that few could endure the fiery day. 'Who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth?'"

Continues Pres. Beecher: "Suppose now the word baptizo to mean as I affirm,—the whole nation are expecting the predicted Purifier; all at once the news goes forth that a great Purifier has appeared, and that all

men flock to him and are purified in the Jordan. How natural the influence ! The great Purifier so long foretold, has at last appeared, and how natural the embassy of the priests and Levites, to inquire who art thou ? and when he denied that he was the Messiah, or either of his expected attendants, how natural the inquiry, why purifiest thou then ? It is his work — of him it is foretold, why dost thou intrude into his place and do his work ?

"In view of these facts, I do not hesitate to believe most fully, that the idea which came up before the mind of the Jews when the word *Joannes ho Baptistes* (John the Baptist) were used, were not John the Immerser, nor John the Dipper, but John the Purifier, a name peculiarly appropriate to him as a reformer — as puritan was to our ancestors, and for the same reason.

"This view has to my own mind the self-evidencing power of truth, for there is not the slightest presumption against it ; all probable evidence is in its favor ; and it explains and harmonizes the facts of the case as no other view does. Indeed, I can never read the account of John's baptism, and his various replies, without feeling that this passage from Malachi gives color to them all. — *Pres. Beecher, pages 25, 26.*

2. There is a similar text in Isaiah iv, 4, in which a great washing or purification is also predicted, to be effected *by the spirit of judgment* and *by the spirit of burning*. This passage is viewed as strictly in keeping with the preceding one, and as also having its accomplishment in the preaching of John and of Christ, and especially on the day of Pentecost. This was the view of the early Fathers. I give that of Basil as a specimen of the whole :

"The Lord shall *wash away* the filth of the sons and daughters of Zion, and shall *purge* the blood of Jerusalem from the midst of them, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning." On this he remarks : "Plainly

the word foretells the same things concerning the Lord by John, who says that he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire; but, concerning himself, he says: 'I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance.' In one series of expressions, in his Greek, the words are pluno and ekkatharizo—in the other baptizo. Hence Basil used the words katharizo and baptizo interchangeably.

"The Fathers in commenting on those passages in the Old Testament, in which it is predicted that the Messiah should purify, do regard them as predictions that he should baptize, and state explicitly that the words baptizo and katharizo mean the same thing. In the Old Testament, it is said concerning the Messiah ekplunei and ekkatharei. In the New, John says, baptisei, and Basil says they mean the same thing; and then defines baptism as meaning katharismos."

"In regarding Isa. iv, 4, as a prophecy of baptism, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, all coincide. And just as clearly do Theodoret and Cyril regard Mal. iii, 3, as a prophecy of baptism; and the same is true of other passages in the Old Testament, in which it is foretold that the Messiah shall purify."

"Inasmuch then, as it was foretold that the Messiah should purify, and inasmuch as purify and baptize are, by the testimony of the Fathers, synonomous, it was of course foretold that the Messiah should baptize. And predictions that he should baptize, would of course awaken an expectation that he would baptize. Hence this expectation is accounted for, as stated before.

"In what manner he should baptize is not foretold, and no doubt all these predictions had a primary reference to spiritual purification, and would have been fulfilled had no external rite of purification been ordained. But so soon as a rite of purification was established by the

forerunner of the Messiah, it would at once call up to the minds of all, the great Purifier, so long foretold, so long expected, and raise the inquiry, Is John he ? If not, why does he purify ? And when the attention was thus aroused, it would of course lead John to unfold to the people the nature of that spiritual purification, of which his purification by water was but a type.

"What struck my mind was this : The language of the New Testament, as to baptism by the Messiah, is exactly such as is used in the Old Testament, with reference to purification by the Messiah. In the old Testament, a *purification* by the Spirit and by fire was spoken of ; in the New, a *baptism* by the Holy Spirit and by fire. An immersion in the Holy Spirit and fire were manifestly absurd ; hence I could not resist the conviction that the Old Testament and New Testament modes of expression were equivalent." — *Beecher, page 216.*

3. There are several other passages in the Old Testament that are viewed as having at least some reference to the scriptural idea of baptism in anticipation of the gospel, and were so viewed by the Fathers. Such, for instance, as the following : " *Wash you, make you clean.*" Isa. i, 16. " Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be *clean* ; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I *cleanse* you." Eze. xxxvi, 25. " *Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean ; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.*" Psa. li, 7. In these passages, the prominent idea is that of a spiritual cleansing or purification, brought to view under the idea of a *washing or cleansing*, by the application of a purifying element. The language, it is true, is symbolical, and has a reference to the Levitical purifications ; but, that it also has a direct reference to the purification of the heart, effected by the Spirit of God, is evident from the fact, that both in Ezekiel and the fifty-first Psalm, it is coupled with a *new* or

*clean heart, and with a new or right spirit.* And it corresponds precisely with the New Testament doctrine — “*the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*”

In conclusion, in these passages too, we have the scriptural idea of baptism brought to view, as symbolically set forth in the Old Testament, and illustrated and explained in the New, in the preaching of John and in the writings of the early Fathers. Here is evidence clear and conclusive, that the word katharizo — of the Septuagint, and baptizo of the New Testament, are synonymous terms: and hence katharizo contains the whole idea of baptizo, as a religious rite, and of course well defines it.

#### § 15. THE NEW TESTAMENT DEFINITION OF BAPTISM.

1. “There were various rituals or prescribed observances under the law of Moses, in which both water and blood were used as emblems of purification or cleansing; which the Apostle denominates (Heb. ix, 10,) ‘*divers washings.*’ In the original it is *diaphorois baptismois* (*divers baptisms.*)

“The reader should here possess himself of definite impressions, as to the true nature of these *purifications* or *baptisms.* They were not literal or actual washings of the body, which were prescribed in these rites, but only *symbolical* cleansings. They were external ceremonies or observances, in which water or blood was applied to persons or things, as a *symbol*, *emblem*, or *sign* of their purification, as consecrated to God, and accepted of him. There was no necessity, therefore, that the water or purifying element, should be used in a sufficient quantity to accomplish an *actual* washing. Any quantity, applied in any mode, might serve as a symbol of cleansing, just as the smallest quantities of bread and wine, broken and

poured out, in whatever mode, are appropriate symbols of the broken body and shed blood of Christ, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

"This is a principle well settled in the scriptures, as acceptable to God in the worship which he requires of men. A purification thus professed and symbolized is a part of the scripture language of worship, a seal of covenant engagements and promises. So among the Jews, when the body of a murdered man had been found, and the murderer had eluded discovery, the elders of the city nearest to the place where the body was found, were required to *wash their hands* — not their whole bodies — over a slain heifer, as a public pledge or protestation of their entire innocence in this matter. Deut. xxi, 1-19. And David says, Psa. xxvi, 6 : 'I will *wash my hands* in innocence.' Here the washing of the hands was intended as an emblem of the innocence of the whole man. "So Pilate 'took water and washed his hands, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person.' Matt. xxviii, 24. And our Saviour said to Peter, 'He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, and is clean every whit.' John xiii, 10.

"The true meaning therefore of the 'divers baptisms' under the law, and of Christian baptism — the main idea, the thing commanded — is *purification* or *consecration*. This is the thing signified by the external symbol; and the mode of applying the symbol is comparatively unimportant. This is especially the case in Christian baptism. Hence no particular mode is prescribed in our Saviour's command to his disciples to *baptize*; and the only thing upon which the mind can fasten, in this command, as of Divine obligation, is the thing signified by the word *baptize*, which is to *purify*, or to *consecrate*, by the application of water in some mode. And not only is no precise mode of applying the symbol prescribed in the

command, but no mode is spoken of afterwards, as binding, or as commanded. The thing called *baptism*, or *purification*, is commanded, but nothing said of the mode; and I maintain that the mode is not indicated by the names *baptism* and *purification*. These names are used to designate the *thing itself*, which is *symbolical cleansing* or *consecration*. And these names, in this respect, are synonomous. They mean the same thing. Both in the New Testament and in the writings of the Christian Fathers, they are used interchangably, the one for the other." — *Dr. Peters*, pp. 36—39.

2. "To obtain a definition of *baptizo* which shall refer to the *intention* of the ordinance and the *import* of the term — a definition which shall express the *substance* of baptism, omitting all reference to the circumstances — we have the soundest warrant and the most explicit examples in the word of God. In John iii, 25, 26, *katharismos* is used as synonomous with *baptismos*; and then the common use of words, as regards the religious rite, is clearly decided.

"The facts are these: John and Jesus were both baptizing, the one in Judea, the other in Enon near to Salim, and in circumstances that there would seem to us a rivalry between the two. And on this point a dispute arose between the disciples of John and the Jews, (or a Jew, as many copies read) about *purifying*. To settle the dispute, they refer it to John, under the shape of a question about *baptizing*. Their minds fastened on the substance, not on the circumstances. Baptism with them was not an *immersion*, nor a *dipping*, nor a *sprinkling*, nor a *pouring*; but a *purifying*; and they state the question to John as a question about *baptizing*. In their view, the words *baptize* and *purify* are so far synonomous, that in a debate about purifying, they may use either the one or the other, or them both indifferently.

"The argument from the facts is this : The dispute in question was plainly a specific dispute concerning baptism, as practiced by Jesus and John, and not a general dispute on the subject of purification at large ; so that a question about baptismon (baptizing) is the true sense ; and if it had been so written, the passage would have been regarded by all as perfectly plain. But instead of baptismon, John has used katharismon, because the sense is entirely the same. In other words, 'a question concerning baptism,' and 'a question concerning purification,' were at that time modes of expression perfectly equivalent ; that is, baptismo is a synonym of katharismo. Assigning this meaning makes the passage natural, lucid, and simple ; to assume a general debate on purification at large, renders it forced and obscure, and the reply of John totally irrelevant.

"No word is more entirely independent of all reference to modes and forms than katharizo, and nothing can more clearly show that baptizo has dropped all reference to form, and assumed the sense to purify or cleanse than making it a synonym of katharizo. And the evidence is the more striking, as it is incidental and undesigned. It is as if we could stand on the plain of Judea, and hear them interchange baptismo and katharismo as synonymous words." \* — *Abridged from Beecher, pages 23, 24.*

"This is the view not only of the Fathers, as Beecher remarks, page 221, but it is also the most natural results of modern criticism. Schleusner, Wahl, Vater, Rosenmuller, De Wette, Bretschneider, Kuinoel, all agree that

\* "The following translation of the passage will present the true sense and the argument at once to the eye :

"After those things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and then he tarried with them, and purified. And John was also purifying in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there, and they came to him and were purified. THEREFORE, there arose a question concerning purification between some of the disciples of John

baptism was the subject of the question ; and Rosenmuller, Vater, Kuinoel, and Schleusner, give baptism as the translation of katharismos, and Deoderlin takes the same view."

3. Again. In Mark vii, 4, 8, katharizo is the natural and obvious sense of baptizo, and katharismos of baptimos. This sense fulfills perfectly all the exigencies of these passages.

"Here is a talk about baptizing, and it is justly admitted by the more intelligent Baptist writers themselves, that, whatever was done, was done by the use of the 'water-pots.' But John ii, 6, represents the water-pots as set '*after the manner of the PURIFYING of the Jews.*' They always *washed their hands* before meals, and when they returned from the market, they, in addition to this, *purify themselves*, (as the nature of the case may require,) before they eat. These ablutions were performed in running water, and by pouring, as the practice still prevails in the East.

"Here, too, baptism is not an immersion in fact, much less in the idea. But above all, the immersion of either the table on which they eat, or the couches on which they reclined at meals, is out of the question. The idea of baptism here is not a mere mode of applying water—certainly not the mode of immersion—but a PURIFYING."

—Dr. Peters.

4. Another example of this is found in Luke xi, 38, 41. "We are here told that a certain Pharisee invited the Saviour to dine with him, and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled and the Jews, and they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same purifieth, and all men come to him.' As if Christ was improperly drawing men away from John's purification. In reply to all this, John clearly avows the superiority of Christ to himself, and justified his cause."

that he had not washed (*ebaptisthe*, baptized) before dinner." And the Lord said unto him, "Now do you Pharisees make clean (*katharizete*, purify) the outside of the cup and the platter," etc. But rather give alms, \* \* \* and behold all things are *clean*, (*kathara*, *pure*) unto you." Now the subject of the Pharisee's wonder was the fact of the Saviour's not *baptizing* before dinner. But the Saviour in shaping his reply to meet the point of the Pharisee's objection, addressed him on the practice of *purifying* the outward man, and of being over exact in mere legal superstitious distinctions between *clean* and *unclean* things, in a ceremonial sense, and advances the principle elsewhere expressed, that "to the *pure*,"—morally—"all things are *pure*." Does not the obvious and natural force of this whole passage go to show, that *baptizo* is here used in the sense of *katharizo*, to purify?"

—Dr. Peters, pages 39, 40.

5. There are several other passages in the New Testament, which might be adduced in evidence of the scriptural meaning of the word *Baptizo*, were it necessary; for instance, the class of texts in which the word *wash*\* is used in reference to baptism, either material or spiritual. As "Arise and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord," Acts xxii, 16. "Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*," Rev. i, 5. "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and *have washed their robes*, and made them *white* in the blood of the Lamb," Rev. vii, 14. And "According to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Titus iii, 5.

It is almost needless to remark, that the primary idea in all these passages, is that of a *purification*; and especially is that idea clear and prominent, when the preposition

\*See § 16, the Note.

apo — from — is connected with the verb ουο — to wash — as in the baptism of Paul,— “ Arise, and be baptized, — be purified — and apolousai — wash away — thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.” And, “ Unto him that loved us, and leusanti — washed us apo — from — our sins in his own blood.” The conclusion is clear and irresistible, that in all these passages, the substance of a great internal spiritual purification, which is symbolized by the external washing of baptism, filled the mind of the inspired penman. There is something incongruous in the very idea of being immersed in the blood of the Lamb, while there is none at all in that of being *purified* — of being *washed from our sins* in his *own* blood. Hence these texts afford strong collateral evidence to the fact already established, that the New Testament meaning of baptizo, is that of WASH or PURIFY.

### § 16. THE DEFINITION OF BAPTIZO\*— APOCRYPHA AND JOSEPHUS.

“ In Sirach iii, 25, baptizo requires the sense katharizo. The passage is this : “ He that is *baptized* from a dead body, and again toucheth it, of what profit to him is his *cleansing*? ” The allusion is to Num. xix, 11–13, where the law simply required *washing* or *purifying*; and the

\* The words with which baptizo is interchanged, in giving variety to style, and preventing the too frequent repetition of the same word, show that it is used by the Fathers in the sense of purify. In such interchanges, we always expect the fundamental idea of the leading term to be retained ; or some one into which it easily passes, and with which it has a natural affinity. The class of words that has an affinity to the idea katharizo, is very large. In Greek, they are louo, (to wash;) hagiazo, (to consecrate, purify, sanctify;) hagnizo, (to purify;) anagennao, (to regenerate;) etc., together with the nouns and participles derived from them, as loutron, hagnismos, etc. The class of words which has an affinity to the idea immersion is small, as it is a mere external act.” Beecher, p. 70.

essential thing in that purification was performed by sprinkling."

"Here," says Pres. Beecher, p. 41, "I remark:

1. The sense, *katharizo*, (purify,) suits the preposition *apo* (from)—immerse does not. It is natural to speak of purifying or cleansing *from*, but not of immersing *from* a dead body.

2. "No immersion, in the case of touching a dead body, was enjoined, but simply a *washing of the body*, so as to leave room for various modes in various circumstances, and it is not likely that this would be spoken of as an immersion.

3. "The rite of purification from a dead body was complex, and no import of the word *baptize*, but the one claimed, is adapted to include the whole. By far the most important part of the rite was the *sprinkling* of the water, in which had been put the ashes of the heifer. Concerning this rite, it is said, that whosoever shall not *purify* himself with it, after touching a dead body, 'That soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* on him.' Of the washing no such thing is said, and Paul, Heb. ix, 13, refers to the *sprinkling*, as if it included the part of the rite on which the effect mainly, if not entirely, depends. It is the ashes of a heifer, *sprinkling* the unclean, that is spoken of as sanctifying to the purification of the flesh. Of course, the writer could not mean to exclude so essential a part of the rite as this, nay its very essence. Nor could he call it an immersion. It is a *sprinkling*. It can *purify*, but it cannot immerse. But the sense, *katharizo*, can include both the sprinkling and the washing: for, taken together, they purify, and this is the complex result of the whole rite, and nothing else. If any object that it is not consistent to apply *loutro* (washing) to a complex operation like this, I ask them, how then is it consistent to apply it

to the blood of Christ, which is spoken of as the *blood of sprinkling?* And yet, we are spoken of as washed from our sins in His own blood, where *louo* (wash) is used. The truth is, that the sense of *louo* is general too, and denotes merely a washing or cleansing, without respect to mode. Besides, an actual washing is a part of the complex rite.” *Pres. Beecher*, p. 41.

2. Again: “The case of Judith also sustains the same view. In Judith xii, 7, we are told that ‘she remained in the camp of Holofernes, three days, and by night, *that is, on each night* she went out to the valley of Bethulia, and purified or washed herself. *Septuagint, baptized herself*, in the camp, at the fountain of water.”

“Here we learn that the purification was performed in the camp, and at or near the fountain, not in the fountain, and for three nights in succession. The context shows that the object of this baptizing, or purifying, was to remove a ceremonial uncleanness. She, without doubt, strictly obeyed the law, and did what the law intended that she should do. But the law in such cases simply commanded *washing*—Lev. xv. The narrator does not intend to signify that she went beyond the law, but that she observed it: and in his view, *wash* is synonymous with *baptize*, in denoting a religious ordinance—a ceremonial purification.” *Dr. Hall*, p. 114.

3. “So, too, the account given by Josephus of the baptism of John, Antiq. B. 18, ch. 5, sec. 2, presents the same train of thought to the mind. Instead of the awkward translation of Whiston, I prefer to give a free statement of the obvious sense, and to quote the original where critical exactness is needed.

“John, he says, informed the Jews, that before they could be baptized, they must commence and profess the practice of piety towards God, and justice towards each other,—and that their baptism would be acceptable to

God, if they did not rely upon it, as a means of putting away a part of their sins, but used it merely as a means of purifying the body, to indicate that the soul had been previously thoroughly purified by righteousness.

"To denote baptism, he uses the word *baptizo*, and to denote its import, he uses the word *katharizo*. Now here, I remark, that there was nothing to cause Josephus or any other Jew to think of the mode, or to attach any importance to it. No idea of a fancied reference in the rite, to the death of Christ, could bias his mind towards the sense immense. To him, it is plain, that it meant nothing but the 'purifying the body, to indicate that the mind had been previously thoroughly purified by righteousness ;' and he speaks just as he would, if these ideas had been suggested by the name of the rite; in other words, just as he would if *kartharsis* had stood in the place of *baptismis*."  
*Beecher, p. 46.*

#### § 17. DEFINITION OF BAPTIZO AND BAPTISMA, AS GIVEN BY THE FATHERS.

Says Pres. Beecher, pp. 47, 48, "I shall now proceed to show that the truth of this view is also to be found in the writings of the Fathers; and that the sense to *purify* is established by direct definition of the Fathers, and of Greek lexicographers, given in a manner most explicit and unambiguous.

"I appeal to them, not because I think that their opinions, on questions of interpretation, or sacred philology, are of much weight, for it is well known to all, that either their attainments in biblical literature were small, or that their principles of philology were to a great extent fluctuating or unsound. Nor do I appeal to them because I deem their theological opinions of peculiar weight. They deserve, indeed, a respectful attention, and

are of great use in investigating the history of opinions. Moreover, they often furnish rich and valuable materials for thought. But nothing can be more desperate than the attempt to make a regular and harmonious system of truth from their works. And it may be added, that they, most of them being native born Greeks, and living in the New Testament age, must have well understood their mother tongue, and both the classical and the sacred meaning of the terms in question.

"My position then is this: if we admit that in the days of Christ, *katharizo* was the import of *baptizo*, taking all the texts in the New Testament, in which the word occurs, and the idea connected with the rite, and looking at the laws of the mind and the natural course of thought, we shall find that no view can so well explain the *usus loquendi* (common use of words) of the Fathers and the opinions entertained by them, and by their opponents, of the import and effects of the rite."

The following definitions are abridged from those of Pres. Beecher, pp. 170-174, by whom they were translated from the Christian Fathers. They are but a few out of more than one hundred quotations made by him.

1. He says, "On this point, I shall first quote Basil. He is commenting on Isa. iv, 4, 'The Lord shall wash away the filth of the sons and the daughters of Zion, and shall purge the blood of Jerusalem from the midst of them by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.' On this he remarks, 'Plainly the word foretells the same things concerning the Lord, by John, who says, that He shall baptize you by the Holy Spirit and fire; but concerning himself, he says, I, indeed baptize you with water unto repentance.' In one series of expressions, the words are *pluno* (to wash) and *ekkatharizo* (to purify), in the other *baptizo*. Basil says that the import of both modes of expression is plainly the same. Nor is this all.

He proceeds, ‘ Since then the Lord has connected both (baptisms,) namely, that from water to repentance, *i. e.* John’s, and that from the Spirit to regeneration, *i. e.* Christ’s, and the word, Isa. iv, 4, alludes to both baptisms, (*i. e.* Christ’s baptism, and that of fire,) are there not three significations of baptism?’ Here he first speaks of baptism in the plural, (*i. e.* the baptisms of John, of Christ, and of fire,) and as, in some respects alike, in others unlike; and this seems to call for a definition of the senses of the word. He says they are three, and proceeds to give them. 1. Purification from filth. 2. Regeneration by the Spirit. 3. Trial or proof in the fire of the judgment. There are three kinds of purification. One external by water—the next, internal by the Spirit, *i. e.* regeneration—the other, a purgation by the fires of the judgment-day. To this purgation by fire, the Fathers referred the words of Paul, 1 Cor. iii, 13–15, the man *saved by fire*, is saved by Basil’s third kind of purification. Concerning this, Hilarius says, ‘ *Being purified by fire* he may be saved.’ Hence Basil refers a part of the purification to this world, and a part to the next, but considers it all as baptism in one way or another.” Nor is the definition accidental, but deliberate and formal. He fixes his eye fully and intently upon the point. He brings three cases in which the word is used. Purification is common to them all,— purification by water, by the Spirit, and by fire. There is a generic likeness, but a specific difference, and so he defines: 1. Natural purification from filth. 2. Spiritual purification, *i. e.*, regeneration. 3. Purgation by trial by fire. Hence it follows, that the name and the nature of baptism coincide, in import, both denote purification.

How unlike all this is to immersion, I need not say. Can any thing be more to the point. Is it not enough to say that to wash away filth, and to purge (in Isaiah,) and

to baptize in the New Testament,—are equivalent modes of expression? Is it not enough, that Basil speaks of baptism in the plural, and refers two to this world, and one to the next, and then goes on to define three corresponding senses of the word, and that each sense is a purification, and neither an immersion? What more could be asked, or received if asked?

2. “Nor is this all. Athanasius testifies explicitly to the same effect. Speaking of the expression, ‘He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit,’ he expressly states that ‘it has the sacrificial sense to purify, *i. e. to remit sins*—and to express this sense, he uses katharizo. His words are: ‘The expression, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit,” means this, that “He shall purify, *i. e.*, absolve you, or remit your sins.”’ That this is the sense is plain, for he adds: “Because the purification (baptisma) of John could not do this, but that of Christ, who has power to *forgive sins*. ”’ This last expression fixes the sense of katharizo, to the remission of sins, or sacramental purification. Athanasius, therefore, directly testifies that this is the sense. Let us hear no more, then, of immersion in the Holy Spirit. Athanasius declares, that purification by the Holy Spirit is the sense.

3: “Once more, the lexicographers, Zonaras and Phavorinus define baptisma (baptism) thus: ‘The remission of sins by water and the Spirit—the unspeakable forgiveness of sin—the loosing of the bond (*i. e.* of sin) granted by the love of God towards man.’ These are obviously all equivalents of sacrificial purification, *i. e.*, remission of sins. They would be perfect definitions of katharismos. Are not two words synonymous to which the same definition can be truly given? These definitions are not the mere opinions of Zonaras and Phavorinus. They are taken from the ideas of the Fathers, and nearly in their words. They also give definitions of the moral (or

spiritual) sense of baptism, *i. e.*, moral purification — thus, ‘The voluntary arrangement of a new life towards God, or according to the will of God, the releasing or recovery of the soul, *i. e.* from sin, for that which is better, *i. e.*, holiness.’”

“ All this certainly denotes moral purification, or the restoration of the soul to a new and holy life. It is equivalent to Basil’s second sense, anagennesis — regeneration. These last definitions would be perfect definitions of katharismos, as denoting moral purification. Again, I ask: are not two words synonymous to which the same definitions can be truly given? Nor are these last definitions the mere opinions of Zonaras and Phavorinus. As before they are taken from the Fathers, and are given in their phraseology, and their style. Is there no evidence in all this? Is it nothing that two lexicographers, writing in Greek, define baptism thus, and say nothing of immersion? Does this look as if immersion is the very essence of baptism, as some assert? Why is all this? The reason is obvious; they were giving the ecclesiastical, the religious sense of the word, and in so doing they could give nothing else.

“ But who was Zonaras, and what the value of his lexicon? He was one of the four leading Byzantine historians. He wrote Annals from the beginning of the world down to 1118. Also a Commentary on the Apostolic Canons, Decrees of Councils, etc. He was first a Courtier in the court of Alexius Commenus, then Monk on mount Athos. Of his history, Tittman says, it is not surpassed by any Byzantine writer. Of his Lexicon: ‘I consider it, after that of Hesychius, the most learned of all others that survive, the most copious, and the most accurate; so that by it we can correct and confirm Suidas, the author of the Etymologium, and others, and even Hesychius himself. Finally, it is invaluable for illustrat-

ing passages of authors — some before published, others preserved in him alone.' The question is not as to the taste and rhetorical excellence of Zonaras. It is this : Did not a historian who wrote in Greek, and was perfectly familiar with the writings of the Greek Fathers, and who wrote commentaries in Greek on the Apostolic Canons, did not he know what baptism means ? And yet of immersion he says nothing ; every definition is an equivalent of katharizo." \*

### § 18. RELATIONS TO THE SYSTEM OF WRITERS.

" No contrary probability, or usage, can be established from the writers of the New Testament age, or of the preceding age, who used the Alexandrian Greek. It will be noticed that the argument thus far is specific, and relates to the religious usage, produced at a particular time, and by particular circumstances, definitely and clearly marked. Now to refute this argument, it is of no use to go to writers who lived and wrote entirely out of this range of circumstances and ideas. It could only prove that, in other circumstances, another usage of the word did exist, and this no one need deny. But it is

\* "Ambrose (one of the Latin Fathers) taking a general view of Jewish and Heathen absolutism, thus sums the whole matter : (Vol. 2, page 355.) 'There are many kinds of (baptismatum) purifications ; but the Apostle proclaims one (baptisma.) Why ? There are (baptismata) purifications (*i. e.* remissions of sin.) Washings they are,—(baptismata) purifications (*i. e.* remissions of sin)—they cannot be. The body is washed, but sin is not washed away, nay, in that washing sin is contracted. There were also (baptismata) purifications of the Jews ; some superfluous, others typical.' Any one can see that the sense of this whole passage turns on assigning to baptismata in the second member of the antithesis, the sacrificial sense of katharismos, *i. e.* absolution, or forgiveness of sins. The purifications of the Gentiles, were not real purifications, for this reason : they did not wash away sins." — Beecher page 167.

very noticeable that, in the very writers where alone proof of an opposite religious usage or even of a probability of it, can reasonably be looked for, there is none to be found. It is in these very writings that the whole current of probability, and of usage, sets strongly the other way.

"I do not deny that these writers do also use the word *baptizo*, in other circumstances, and in a secular sense, to denote immersion, sinking, overwhelming or oppression. But this only proves that the two usages did co-exist; just as Dr. Carson proves that the two usages of *bapto* did co-exist in Hippocrates, and that the existence of the one did not disprove the existence of the other. So at least four meanings of the word *spring* co-exist, and yet no one infers from one that the others do not exist.

"That the religious usage of these writers all sets one way, one obvious and admitted fact may show. Dr. Carson admits that all the lexicographers and commentators do assign to the word *baptizo* the unlimited sense to *wash* or *cleanse*. Now on what writers do they (the lexicographers and commentators) rely? Beyond all dispute on the writers of the Alexandrian (or New Testament) Greek, the very writers who have furnished all the facts on which this argument is based. And these writers be it noticed, furnish no presumption or usage the other way. Even in those minuter shades of meaning, which are furnished by allusion, comparison, or association of ideas, all things tend the same way. So, in the account of the baptism of Paul, the sacrificial reference of baptism is plainly indicated. Acts xxii, 16: 'Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*, calling upon the name of the Lord.' Here we have faith in Christ, the washing away, or pardon of sins, and a purification intended to symbolize it. Baptisai, purify thyself, or be purified bodily — apolousai — *wash away thy sins*, as to the mind, by calling upon the name of the Lord. Here the anti-

thesis and correspondence are beautiful and complete, and one seems naturally to suggest the other. So the case in 1 Peter iii, 21, when he speaks of baptism as saving us, is far more natural and beautiful, if we adopt this sense, for he seems to think that, if he left the word baptism unguarded, he might be taken to mean the external purification of the body. But as this does not save us, and as nothing but the purification of the mind does, he guards himself, and says, I do not mean the putting away the filth of the flesh, by the purification of which I speak, but the answering of a good conscience towards God. Hence too, the legal or sacrificial sense lies upon the very face of the passage—for it is the purification of the conscience by atoning blood, to which he refers, and not to an external washing at all; and I need not say to any one who can feel the nice correspondencies of words, how much more beautiful and clear the whole passage becomes by assigning to baptismo the sense of a spiritual purification, by the blood of Christ, which Peter affirms that it has.—*Beecher, pp. 44, 45.*

In further illustration of this subject, I will close this section, by adding the view of the Fathers upon the text last quoted (1 Pet. iii, 21, and 1 Cor. x, 2.) These passages show conclusively that the writers, in both instances, employed the word baptism in the legal or sacrificial sense.

“In explaining the similitude between baptism and the salvation of Noah in the ark, also between baptism and the passage of the Israelites through the Red sea—Noah and the Israelites are not looked on by the Fathers as immersed, but merely as *purified* or *saved*: and that too by the same element which overwhelmed and destroyed the enemies of God. They even go so far as to speak of the *wicked* as *immersed*, by way of antithesis to the righteous, who are not *immersed*, but only *purified* and *saved*.

This view is based on the expression in Peter, '*saved by water*,' as applied to the eight souls, who were saved by water in the ark. To be purified by them was equivalent to *being sanctified*, or *being saved*; and in looking at baptism, their minds were fixed on this idea: 'Now,' said they, 'as in baptism water saves, so in the flood it saved, and so in the Red sea it saved; not by overwhelming Noah or the Israelites, but by dividing them from the enemies of God, and by overwhelming and immersing those enemies. And its similarity to baptism lies only in the fact, that it *saves* and *purifies* the people of God.' — *Beecher*, p. 73.

### § 19. THE FINAL RESULT.

I have now brought the arguments derived from the usages of the Alexandrine or New Testament Greek, and from the scriptural idea of baptism to a close, as regards the import of the word *baptizo*, (and *baptismos* or *baptisma*,) and am fully persuaded that the evidence elicited is both satisfactory and conclusive; and submit the following as the *result* of the investigation thus far:

1. There is a remarkable difference between the Pagan classical or Greek and the Greek of the New Testament; owing to a variety of influences, such as the extension of the Greek language in the east, the Septuagint version of the scriptures, etc.; which brought that beautiful language to be applied to subjects altogether new to the Greeks themselves, especially ideas peculiar to a revealed and experimental religion. These facts subjected the word *baptizo*, as well as many others, to great and important changes, to express the things of the Spirit. For the

Pagan Greeks never employed the word *baptizo* as a religious term, while the Jews, on the other hand, never used it in any other than a religious, or a ceremonial sense.

2. *Baptizo*, the word selected by the Holy Spirit to designate the ordinance of Christian baptism, is a term of Greek origin, and was not translated, but simply transferred to the English language, as it had been to the Latin and some others, as a *sacred* name, like *Jehovah*, *Immanuel*, etc., by which to denote that sacrament through all future time ; and it was as well understood as any other word in our language, until the natural operation of the association of ideas was interrupted, by the long and sore controversy in which the subject is now involved.

3. And the word *baptizo*, according to its classical usage, includes a wide range of meanings, varying from an entire submersion *in* a fluid — as water — to a mere smearing, wetting, or sprinkling *with* a fluid ; and that not by metaphor, as some contend, but by an extension of its literal meaning. And it is employed in this usage of meaning, both as a specific and a generic term, in its different applications. For instance, to dip, plunge, immerse, pour and sprinkle, are all specific and modal ; while to wash, cleanse, purify, dye, tinge, wet, moisten, etc., are all generic ; and such acts may be performed by different modes of application. Again : This distinction of general and specific does not correspond with the ordinary distinctions relative to the different senses of the word as primary, secondary, etc., but commingles with them — for instance, dip, plunge, immerse, belong to the primary class of meanings ; while pour and sprinkle, (also specific) will range under the third class of meanings.

4. Finally, the New Testament meaning of *baptizo* is, to *wash*, to *cleanse*, to *purify* ; which corresponds with the secondary meaning, given by the lexicographers and

classical writers; and is analogous to the idea of the Levitical purification expressed in the Septuagint by *kathairo* or *katharizo*, (to purify,) of which it is a perfect synonym. And these words, *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*, are not specific and modal, but are strictly generic, allowing the greatest latitude as to mode.

The following is from the able pen of Dr. Hall, pp. 115, 116, "If we follow the scripture pattern," says he, "or the pattern of the Greek of the Apocrypha, (or that of Josephus and the Fathers,) in fixing the proper idea of the word *baptize*, as used to denote the *sacred* use of water in a religious ordinance, we shall entirely omit all reference to mode, and fix our thoughts upon the intent and the effect of baptism; the substance and not the shadow. Baptism will not be a dipping, or an immersion, or a pouring, or a sprinkling, but a **WASHING**, a **PURIFYING**.

"The word being thus used in the New Testament, to denote a ritual washing or purifying, (which it never signified in classic Greek); being used moreover when the MODE of purifying was either sprinkling or pouring; and being, still further, so used that to make it read *immerse*, would make the Bible speak what confessedly is not true: I think we have clearly,—and established beyond the possibility of a successful denial,—a generic and peculiar *New Testament use of the word*; in which use *baptize* primarily denotes a ritual purifying by some manner of application of water; which is called '**the WASHING of water**'; and secondary, it denotes an inward purifying by the Holy Ghost, called '**the WASHING of regeneration**'."

These things being so, how idle it is for our Baptist brethren to ask, as they often do, "If any application of water, *washing*, *sprinkling*, *pouring*, etc., means baptism, why did not the sacred writers sometimes use the Greek

word which means to wash, sprinkle, and pour?" The reason is plain:

1. Baptize is used with a peculiar but generic reference to this *purifying*, without any reference to mode. But the word *sprinkle* and *pour* are not so used. Their use in the New Testament is not limited to the *sacred* use of water; and they refer to *mode*; while the word baptize in the New Testament, refers to none. They cannot, therefore, be interchanged with baptize, as though they were synonymous with it. The word *wash* is so interchanged, because it so far accords with baptize as not to refer to any particular mode.\*

2. It is not true that the words, wash, sprinkle, pour, are not used in the New Testament with reference to baptism. As often as anything is said in the New Testament in allusion to a mode of baptism, these words are invariably used. As to the word *wash*, as has been remarked, the scriptures refer to baptism as '*the washing of water*;' and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, they call '*the washing of regeneration*.' As to the word *sprinkle*, the prophets describe the purifying which they foretell, as a *sprinkling*; '*So shall He sprinkle many nations*.' '*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you*,' etc. As to the word *pour*, the mode of the Spirit's baptizing, is spoken of as a *pouring out*, a *shedding forth*, a *falling upon*, etc.

But where do you read of "the *immersing* of water," or "the *immersing* of many nations," or "the *immersing* of regeneration," or of "the *immersing* of the blood of Christ?" Nowhere in the word of God: no where even in figure. The very idea is strange and preposterous. We may retort the question, if it be so, that baptism is

\* See the Note under Section 16.

nothing but immersion, and that immersion is all essential to it ; why is it that we never read of "the *immersion* of regeneration," — or of a promise, "then will I *immerse* you in clean water, and ye shall be clean ;" or of "the *immersion* of the blood of Christ ? "

I will close this section in the language of Pres. Beecher, p. 81. He says : "To conclude, the idea of purification is, in the nature of things, better adapted to be the name of the rite, than immersion. It has a fitness and verisimilitude in all its extensive variety of usage, which cause the mind to feel the self-evidencing power of truth, as producing harmony and agreement in the most minute, as well as in the most important relations of the various parts of this subject to each other. This is owing to three facts : (1.) The idea of purification is the fundamental idea in the whole subject. (2.) It is an idea complete and definite in itself in every sense, and needs no adjunct to make it more so. (3.) It is the soul and center of a whole circle of delightful ideas and words. It throws out before the mind a flood of rich and glorious thoughts, and is adapted to operate on the feelings like a perfect charm. To a sinner, desiring salvation, what two ideas so delightful as forgiveness and purify ? Both are condensed into this one word. It involves in itself deliverance from the guilt of sin, and from its pollution.\* It is a purification from sin in every sense. It *is purification* by the atonement, and purification by the truth — by water and by blood. And around these ideas cluster others likewise, of holiness, salvation, eternal joy, eternal life. No word can produce such delight on the heart, and send such a flood of light into all the relations of divine truth ; for purification, in the broad scripture sense, is the joy and salvation of man, and the crowning glory of God.

\* See Section 13.

"Of immersion none of these things are true. (1.) Immersion is not a fundamental idea in any subject or system. (2.) By itself, it does not convey any one fixed idea, but depends upon its adjuncts, and varies with them. Immersion ! In what ? Clear water or filthy, in a dying fluid, or in wine ? Until these questions are answered, the word is of no use. And with the spiritual sense (as we have just seen) the case is still worse ; for common usage limits it in English, Latin, Greek, and so far as I know, in all languages, by adjuncts of a kind denoting *calamity*, or *degradation*, and never purity."

## THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER IV.

#### THE SCRIPTURE MODE OF BAPTISM — SPRINKLING.

HAVING produced an abundance of evidence as to the import of the word *baptizo*, I shall now proceed to the examination of the *mode* of baptism ; and feel the greatest confidence that I shall be able to prove to a demonstration, *that sprinkling is the scriptural mode of Christian baptism* ; at least to the *unbiased* mind.

The Bible is a plain book, and was originally designed to be read and understood ; and doubtless, when rightly interpreted, it explains itself. And as the rite of baptism is one of the sacraments of the New Testament, and as such it is the imperative duty of all men to become familiar with the ordinance, and to participate in it, at some period in life ; it therefore becomes a matter of the very first importance, that the rite be well understood by all, in its *mode, design, and significance*. And although the mode does not at all affect the ordinance as respects its validity, yet, from considerations already offered, it is a matter of no small importance. For though there is no *positive* evidence in the scriptures, as to any particular mode of application — from the incidental way in which it occurs — still, by taking the Old and New Testament in connection, and looking at the fundamental idea of *atonement* and *purification* which pervades the whole scheme, it will

finally conduct the inquiring mind to the proper clue to the mode of Christian baptism.

The great system of truth, or scheme of human redemption, is a whole, and there is a correspondence in all its parts ; it is hence altogether reasonable, that there should be a strict analogy between the purifications of the Mosaic ritual and those of the gospel. For doubtless every important truth was taught under the former dispensation by metaphor, figure, type, or in some shape or other. And if sprinkling was chosen by the Holy Spirit, as a suitable emblem of both ceremonial and spiritual purification under the former dispensation, is it at all improbable that it should be continued under the latter, to denote the principal part of the same thing — the remission of sins by the blood of Christ, and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit ? And it is a remarkable fact, that in all the purifications of the law, there were no immersions of persons enjoined — it is true there were of things in a very few instances — and they were all to be performed by washing, bathing, sprinkling — commonly the latter. Nevertheless, it is also true, that there were some purifications enjoined, in which the mode of application was not prescribed, but it was left optional with the individuals themselves as to mode : and it is altogether probable that, under the circumstances, there were some immersions really practiced.

#### § 20. JEWISH PURIFICATIONS — BAPTISM.

In Mark vii, 4, 8, and Luke xi, 38, there are baptisms brought to view, but not immersions. “ For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*nipsonti\**) their

\* “ The force of Louo, Nipto, and Pluno :

“ *Louo*, of its own force, denotes to *wash*, or *purify*; it is in fact, generally used to denote a *washing* or *purifying* of the whole body, whether by

hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they came from the market, except they wash they eat not, and many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." The words *wash* and *washing* are in the original (*baptisontai*;) except they have *baptized themselves*; and (*baptismous*) *baptisms*.

"Nothing in the context demands the sense immerse, and powerful reasons forbid it. All must confess that purification is the only idea involved in the subject of thought. This sense fulfills perfectly all the exigencies of the passages. I know indeed that is said by some, that in Mark there is a rise in the idea from the lesser washing of the hands, which was common before all meals, to the greater washing implied in the immersion of the body after coming from the market. But on the other hand, there is simply a change from the specific to the general and indefinite. They always *wash their hands* before meals, and when they return from the market, they, in addition to this, *purify themselves*, (as the nature of the case may require) before they eat." — Beecher, p. 38.

### 1. *The Primary Idea of Purifying.*

"The thing signified by baptism, both Jewish and Christian, as we have seen, is purifying or cleansing. But sprinkling, affusion, or immersion — but it is also applied to hands, face, and feet — also to wood, clothes, couches, cloaks, etc., though but rarely in this last sense.

"*Nipto* applies generally to washing of hands, face, and feet, also sometimes, but more rarely, to bathing the whole body, in the case of both men and animals. It is also often used by the Fathers, with its compounds, to denote the cleasing of the mind from sin, excluding the idea of hand washing. Sometimes also, it is applied to the washing of cups, vessels, and tables.

"*Pluno* is generally applied to clothes — but also to the body and all its parts, also to cups, metals, and various animal substances." — Beecher, pages 210, 211.

the primary idea of purifying or cleansing is, the application of water to the person or thing purified or cleansed. So, in the examples already referred to, in the Old Testament, of ceremonial cleansings — which the Apostle calls *baptisms*, the water was applied to the persons, and not the persons to the water. They were in every instance performed by *sprinkling*.” — *Dr. Peters*, p. 60.

## 2. *The Purification of Persons.*

“In Luke it is said : ‘A certain Pharisee besought him (the Saviour) to dine with him : and he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that he had not first *washed* (baptized) before dinner.’ So of the first part of the verse (Mark vii, 4:) ‘Except they *wash* (baptize) they eat not.’

“This *baptizing* was the simple washing of the hands with a little water drawn from the water-pots, and *poured on them*. This is abundantly proved by the custom still prevalent in eastern countries. It was a mere ceremonial washing, and the water-pots were not of sufficient dimensions to render immersion possible. They contained only ‘two or three firkins,’ that is about ten or twelve gallons ‘apiece ;’ and they were made small at the top, like a common jar. Yet the washing of the hands with a little water drawn from those pots, and poured on them, was a *baptism*, that is, a *purification* of the whole person from ceremonial defilement. Thus far it is plain that baptisms were performed by applying the water to the person, and not the person to the water.” — *Dr. Peters*, p. 62.

Continues he : “I will here add the following brief remarks :

“1. The leading idea throughout these passages is that of purification — a purifying ‘according to the tradition of the elders.’ Compare Matt. xv, 2 : ‘The Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walkest not thy disciples

according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with *unwashen* hands ?'

" 2. This washing (*nipsonti*) of the hands was a baptism, and not a baptism of the hands only, but as the form of the original language, as well as our own translation shows, a baptism of the persons ; they (the persons) were baptized when their *hands* had been washed for a ceremonial purpose.

" 3. The word washed (*ebaptisthe*) in Luke xi, 38, is, letter for letter, in all respects precisely the same, as that used in Mark i, 9 : ' Jesus (*ebaptisthe*) was baptized of John in Jordan.' In Luke, the Holy Ghost affirms the baptism of the person as fully, and as absolutely as he does when he says, Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan. Yet the baptism in Luke was no immersion, but a simple ablution of the hands by pouring, or allowing water to run over them."

These two passages have presented insuperable difficulties in the way of immersionists of all descriptions. It is somewhat amusing to look at the many shifts and discordant theories resorted to by their leading writers, to remove these difficulties out of the way, and make immersion appear at least possible in each case. I will here beg indulgence from the reader to make a brief reference to them, even at the expense of appearing tedious ; and leave the indulgent reader to make his own reflections upon those palpable discrepancies and inconsistencies.

" Mr. Judd, in his reply to Prof. Stuart, p. 25, translates the passage in Mark vii, 4 : " And when they came from the market, except they baptisontai — *baptize themselves.*" In the same manner he makes the Pharisee in Luke xi, 38, wonder that Jesus had not been baptized before dinner. As Mr. Judd maintains that baptize must and shall mean immerse, he maintains that baptize not only may have its usual meaning here, but that 'that

meaning is absolutely required by the scope and harmony of the passages ;' that is, he will make the scripture here testify that the Pharisees and all the Jews immersed their whole bodies before eating, as often as they came from the market."

"The learned George Campbell, whom our Baptist brethren are so fond of quoting on these passages, finds it impossible to carry out his theory. He is about the work of translating the New Testament; and he is determined beforehand that baptize must mean exclusively immerse.

"Mark says, that the 'Pharisees and all the Jews, when they came from the market, except they *baptize themselves*, eat not.' Mr. Campbell does not believe that they *immersed themselves* as often as they came from the market. What does he do ? Does he give a grammatical and faithful *translation* of the word baptize ? He does not. He gives no translation : he makes a gloss ; he gives a commentary, and 'corrects and alters the diction' of the Scriptures, by substituting his comment in the place of the word which the Holy Ghost teacheth. And this is his comment — for no scholar, I trust, will ever venture to call it a translation. 'For the Pharisees, and indeed all the Jews who observe the tradition of the elders, eat not, except they have washed their hands by *pouring a little water upon them*.' The words, 'by pouring a little water upon them,' are not in the original ; they are inserted by Mr. Campbell. I would demand, does the word *nipto* necessarily limit the mode of washing to '*pouring a little water on the hands* ?' Does it not mean to *wash*, and simply to wash, without referring in the least to the mode ; whether by pouring the water on the hands, or by dipping them ?"

"The remarks of Prof. Ripley on these two passages, in his examination of Prof. Stuart, are, it seems to me, as curious a piece of non-committal, and of tripping lightly

over ground on which one dares not to tread firmly as can be found in the whole compass of biblical criticism.

“He thinks the passage in Mark may be rendered, ‘without the least violence to its language,’ so as to make it read that the Pharisees and all the Jews, immerse their whole bodies, as often as they come from the market. (Mark it) *may* be rendered ‘without *violence* to the language!’ instead of ascertaining what the truth is, and giving a faithful rendering accordingly.” \* \* \* See Dr. Hall, pp. 100, 104.

### 3. *The Purification of Things.*

“But there were also ceremonial purifications of *things* — as well as of *persons*, among the Jews, which Christ and his Apostles were accustomed to speak of as *baptisms*. The Evangelist Mark says (vii, 4,) of the Pharisees and all the Jews: ‘When they come from the market, except they *wash*, (*baptisontai*) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (*baptismous*) of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables.’ The word here translated *tables* is *klinon*, and properly signifies *beds* or *couches*. It is so translated in the thirtieth verse of this chapter, and eight other places where it occurs in the New Testament. They had no chairs, and these couches were a kind of sofa or divan, on which they were accustomed to sit, leaning on each other, according to the usual modes of sitting in those days.

“Now the ‘cups, and pots, and brazen vessels,’ here spoken of, may possibly have been immersed all over in water. But this is by no means probable. They doubtless washed them in a common sense way, by the application of water with the hand, or a cloth, holding them partly in the water, or over it; or they poured water on them, to suit their convenience. And to suppose that the

*beds or couches* were *immersed*, would be preposterous, especially if we consider the superstition of the Jews, which led them to practice these purifications many times in a day. To have immersed their couches so often, would have kept them constantly unfit for use. Besides, these washings, or *baptisms*, were merely ceremonial, and we have already seen that such purifications or baptisms, in many cases, were performed by sprinkling." — *Dr. Peters*, pp. 60, 62.

But if it is still insisted that *tables* is the correct rendering of the word *klinon*, it does not help the case. "Whoever considers what cumbersoine pieces of furniture these tables were—*fifteen* or *twenty* feet long, by four feet broad, and about four feet high—may judge whether they were *plunged* after every meal taken upon them."

Says Pres. Beecher, page 39: "But above all, the immersion of the couches on which they reclined at meals, is out of the question. That this is the meaning of *klinon* here, the whole context shows, and all impartial critics allow; and these were large enough for three to recline upon at their ease. And are we to believe that the Pharisees and *all the Jews*, were in the habit of immersing these? Is it likely that a *whole nation* ever held to a practice like this? That they should *purify* them with various uncommanded rites is altogether probable. But that they should immerse them is totally incredible.

Dr. Carson seems to feel this point keenly, and yet manfully maintains his ground. He says that he will maintain an immersion until its *impossibility* is proved, and suggests that the couches might be so made as to be taken to pieces for this end!"

## § 21. LEVITICAL PURIFICATIONS — BAPTISMS.

"In Heb. ix, 10. we read of a ritual service *which stood* only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings. In the original it is (*diaphorois baptismois*) '*divers baptisms.*'

"In this case the word does not relate to the ordinance of Christian baptism, but to Mosaic purifications. Yet it is still a religious use of the word; moreover it is applied with reference to those very usages, of which I have spoken, as adapted to cause the word *baptizo* to pass from its original to its secondary sense, to *purify*. Hence it is an example of great weight in the case, and, as might have been expected, it has been strongly contested. But with how little reason I shall endeavor to show." — *Peters.*

"The scope of the chapters eight, nine, and ten, is to show that the purifications legal and moral, provided by Christ for the conscience and the heart, had in themselves a real efficacy, and were, therefore, entirely superior to those of the Mosaic dispensation, which related only to the body, and could produce no purity but such as was merely external and symbolical. Let now the following things be noticed :

1. "Those things only are spoken of in the whole discussion, which have a reference to action on the worshipers — that is, the whole passage relates to the effects of the Mosaic ritual entirely on *persons*, and not on *things*. The gifts, the sacrifices, the blood of sprinkling, the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, all relate to persons.

2. "The baptisms are spoken of as enjoined, as well as the other rites. But of persons, no immersions at all are enjoined under the Mosaic ritual.

3. "The only immersions enjoined in the Mosaic law

were immersions of things, to which no reference can be had here,—as vessels, sacks, skins, etc. In this case no act was performed that directly affected the body of the *worshiper*, but only the thing immersed. But in all this passage, Paul regards the ritual with reference to its effects on the *worshiper*.

4. “Besides, the purifications of the persons are *divers*, *various*; but the immersions of things are not, either in act, or circumstance, or end. If vessels or things became unclean, in the cases specified, they were all immersed, and all *alike*—and all for the same end. What *various* immersions here !

“On the other hand, the purifications of men were exceedingly numerous, and of various kinds. Some were legal and sacrificial, relating to the atonement, and made by blood. Others were moral, relating to regeneration and purity of heart, as symbolized, sometimes by various kinds of washing, and other times by sprinkling. To all these various kinds reference is had in the context.”—*Abridged from Beecher, pages 34, 36.*

“Let us recur then to the remark with which this section was introduced, viz: that there were various ritual or prescribed observances, under the law of Moses, in which both water and blood were used as emblems of purification or cleansing. And the ‘water-pots’ and other preparations for these observances were in common use in our Saviour’s time. So, at the marriage feast at Cana of Galilee, we read (John ii, 6,) that ‘there were set there six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the *purifying* of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece.’ These things were all familiar to Christ and his Disciples, long before Christian baptism was instituted, and when they spoke of them in the Greek language, they called them *purifyings* or *baptisms*. So (Heb. ix 10,) the Apostle speaks of the Jewish ritual service as standing

in ‘meats and drinks, and *divers washings*,’ (baptisms.) Then going on to compare the Jewish dispensation with that of Christ, to show the glory of the latter, he refers to one of these *divers baptisms*, and shows us what he means.

“The case to which he refers is that described (Num. xix, 18,) as follows: and for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of *purification for sin*, and *running water* shall be put thereto *in a vessel*; and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and *sprinkle* it upon the lent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave.’ Now it is this *sprinkling*, which the Apostle refers to, as one of the *divers baptisms*, which were practiced among the Jews, and says (Heb. ix, 13, 14:) ‘If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, *sprinkling* the unclean, sanctifieth to the *purifying* of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, etc., *purge* your conscience from dead works.’

“It is clear, from these expressions, that *sprinkling*, in the mind of the Apostle, was a mode of baptism. It was a baptism too, which was emblematic of *purification*, the very thing that baptism signifies under the gospel, according to the different ideas of *purification* in the two dispensations, the one of the flesh, the other of the Spirit. And the *sprinkling* was here performed in a summary way, with a bunch of hyssop, which they dipped in the fluid and *sprinkled* it upon the people in groups, as they stood. This hyssop was a small herb, probably resembling moss. It is spoken of (1 Kings, iv, 33) where it is called the ‘hyssop that springeth out of the wall.’ This they used alone, or mixed it with wool, as a kind of sponge, for the purpose of retaining water. And the sprinkling with this was a *baptism*, in the scripture meaning of *baptizo*. It is here called a *baptism* by the Apostle.

" He proceeds to speak of a similar *baptism* performed by Moses, when he dedicated the first testament, and says, (Heb. ix, 19) : ' When Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book and all the people.' The reference is to Exed. xxiv, 5-8. How grand and solemn was the occasion, when Moses thus dedicated the covenant ! There were at that time six hundred thousand men capable of bearing arms in Israel. The people must have numbered two or three millions. Yet they were all *baptized* with water, mingled with blood, and *sprinkled* upon them from a bunch of hyssop and wool, as an emblem of their religious purification before God. Now it is in vain to say that these were Jewish ordinances which were done away in Christ, and therefore prove nothing. They do prove the very thing for which I bring them forward. They prove that *sprinkling* in the mind of the Apostle, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned, was a *mode* of baptism.

" Another of these *divers baptisms* is described in Num. viii, 7. In purifying the Levites and setting them apart to their office, Moses says : ' Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them ; *sprinkle* the water of purifying upon them.' etc. The leper was in like manner to be cleansed by *sprinkling*. Lev. xiv, 7.

" *Sprinkling*, then, among the Jews was the emblem of *cleansing* or *purification*. But Christ and his Apostles were born in the Jewish Church, and were familiar with the idea so often exemplified in the daily services to which they were accustomed. So, when speaking of the spiritual cleansing produced by the blood of Christ, Paul calls it ' the blood of *sprinkling*' , Heb. xii, 24 ; and Peter calls it ' the *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ,' 1 Pet. i, 2.

" Now Christian baptism was instituted as an emblem

of this same internal spiritual cleansing, of which both Paul and Peter speak above, as a *sprinkling*. This was the idea in their minds when they thought of the significance of the ordinance of baptism. They never speak of it as an *immersion* in the blood of Christ, or an *immersion* in the Holy Ghost. They attach no such ideas to the mode of purification, external or internal, whether by blood, by water, or by Spirit. \* \* \*

"From these facts, so fully attested, it must be inferred, that *sprinkling*, so far as the mode is concerned, was the idea in the minds of Christ and his Apostles in the institution of baptism, as an emblem of the *spiritual cleansing* of persons. Carrying this idea into practice, they would naturally adopt *sprinkling* as their mode of baptism. That they actually did baptize in this mode will appear still more probable, from considerations yet to be introduced." — *Dr. Peters*, pp. 44-50.

## § 22. PURIFICATION BY THE BLOOD OF CHRIST — SPRINKLING.

We have already seen that the chief efficacy of all the Levitical purifications — whether by water or by blood — lay in the fact that they were *sprinkled*. Shed blood *alone* would not suffice — it must not only be shed, but also applied by *sprinkling*, to benefit the worshiper. So, of the paschal lamb, (Exod. xii, 7, 22.) It would not suffice to slay the lamb, but to render it available when the destroying angel passed through the land, the blood must be *sprinkled* upon the "posts and lintels of the door." This was God's method of deliverance in that instance; and that sprinkling of the blood of the lamb was regarded by the Greek Fathers as a baptism. Then it was that every dwelling in Goshen was marked for preservation. And so, of the blood of Jesus Christ our

Passover. It is of no avail that his most precious blood has been shed for us, unless it is also applied in the way of God's own appointment — it must be *sprinkled* upon our hearts by the Holy Spirit. All our race are as much exposed to destruction, by the impending wrath of a sin-hating God, as any of the dwellers in Goshen, until we are like them, marked for preservation by the *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ. Hence, from all these instances collected from the law — which was the shadow of good *things to come* — we are brought to the conclusion that, the main efficacy, nay, the very essence of these rites, was lodged in the *sprinkling* — the prescribed mode of application ; which was also symbolical of moral or spiritual purification.

It is a conceded fact, so far as I know, that the main design of water baptism is to represent the atonement of Christ, in all its efficacy, to remit sin and purify the heart. In this it corresponds with the legal, or sacrificial sense of baptism ; or, in other words, with the relation which baptism sustains to the atonement of Christ.\* In this sense, baptism also corresponds with the double object of atonement : 1. To remove the guilt of sin, or the liability to suffer the penalty of the law ; and, 2. To remove the pollution of sin, or to purify the heart, and produce holiness of life. The scriptures uniformly ascribe their invaluable blessings to the atonement or blood of Christ, as applied to the awakened conscience. We are represented as *redeemed* by his blood, as *justified* by his blood, as *purged* or *cleansed* by his blood, and as *washed from our sins* in his own blood ; "He by himself *purged* our sins," Heb. i, 3 ; "And the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, *cleanseth* us from all sin," 1 John i, 7.

The doctrine of atonement, as has been frequently remarked, is brought prominently to view, and pervades

\* See § 13.

the whole system of salvation. The advent, sufferings, and atonement of Christ, had long been the subject of promises and prophecies, and the objects of faith to the Old Testament saints ; and his saving benefits were typically set forth in the Mosaic ritual, especially in the purification by “water and blood.” Says the Apostle, (Heb. ix, 22,) “And almost all things are by the law *purged with blood*; and without shedding of blood is no *remission*.”

But, in the fullness of time, the promised Deliverer did come, and when he expiated our sins on the Roman cross, “a soldier pierced his side with a spear, and forthwith came thereout *blood and water*.” And the Apostle John says, 1 Epistle v, 6, “This is he that came by *water and blood*, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by *water and blood*.” His coming had been presented to the eye of faith by these striking symbols all along through the former dispensation. But his advent opened to the house of David that *fountain of purification*, which Zephaniah saw in vision, and which John celebrates, as the *Fountain of the Water of Life*, for the washing away of sin and uncleanness.

It was in view of this Fountain of *living water* — or the atonement of Christ — that God had said, by his prophet, in reference to the gospel day, “Then will I sprinkle *clean water* upon you, and ye shall be *clean*,” Eze. xxxvi, 25; and the Saviour said to Nicodemus, (John iii, 5,) “Except a man be born of *water*, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” The reference was made directly to the method of purifying, as practiced among the Jews, and in language well understood by that distinguished master in Israel. And it was in reference to that same Fountain of Life, that John speaks, when in vision he saw a great multitude of the redeemed before the throne, who had *washed* their robes, and made them *white in the blood of the Lamb*, Rev. vii, 9, 14. Again, he

heard them ascribing their redemption to his blood, in these strains, “Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood,*” etc. Rev. i, 6.

Now, the use which I wish to make of these remarks is, to obtain additional evidence in favor of the scripture mode of baptism. The Apostle says, (Heb. ix, 13, 14,) “For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth, to the purifying of the flesh ; how much more shall the *blood of Christ purge your conscience* from dead works, to serve the living God. The sentence is elliptical, and, if supplied, would read thus: “How much more shall the blood of Christ (*sprinkling the heart*) *purge your conscience* from dead works, etc. There is a comparison instituted between the blood of Christ and the blood of animals slain in sacrifice. The one availed for the purification of the flesh ceremonially, but could not reach and affect the conscience ; the other—the blood of Christ—could purge or purify the conscience ; but the mode of application is the same—that of *sprinkling*. But if any should still doubt the correctness of this position, with regard to the mode of application—and, by consequence, the mode of baptism—there is another text upon the subject, both clear and explicit: (Heb. x. 22,) “Having our hearts *sprinkled from an evil conscience*, and our bodies *washed with pure water*.” The *pure water* is, doubtless, the water used in baptism, which is called *a washing*, in allusion to the water of separation, (Num. xix, 13, 21.) But the heart is also *sprinkled* from an evil conscience by the blood of Christ, called the *blood of sprinkling*; and which possesses efficacy to *purge* or *wash away* sin, and to produce what Peter calls a *good* conscience, 1 Epis. iii, 21. The Apostle, speaking of a baptism which now saves us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, says, it is “not the putting away the filth of the flesh,” as the different kinds

of baptisms did under the law, for the ceremonially unclean, “but the answer of a good conscience towards God,”—that is, a conscience *sprinkled with the blood* of Jesus Christ, and *purged from dead works*, to serve the living God. Hence, there is a higher baptism than that connected with the Jewish ceremonial, which reaches and changes the heart, and purges or purifies the conscience; and that baptism is accomplished by the *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ.

Now, it is not contended that there is a literal application of Christ’s blood to the polluted soul of man. The language is figurative. There could be no real contact between matter and spirit. The application is a virtual and spiritual one. It is made by the Spirit of God, by virtue of the obedience, sufferings, and atonement of Christ. The blood of Christ was actually shed to maintain the dignity of the Divine government; and it possesses a cleansing virtue, a purifying merit, in a moral point of view, which is applied to the heart and conscience at the moment of conversion. Hence, there is a relation existing between the atonement of Christ and the forgiveness of sin—between the reception of water baptism and the thing which it signifies—the application of Christ’s blood by the Spirit of God. Of course, then, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the remission of sins by the blood of Christ is, in fact, the same thing; and it is effected by virtue of the atonement of Christ; and the Spirit’s *mode* of baptizing, or *mode* of applying the blood of atonement, is by *sprinkling*.

In conclusion, we arrive at the following truths :

1. The subject of discussion in this section has been, the great design of water baptism to set forth, symbolically, spiritual baptism; or, the purification of the heart and conscience by an application of the blood of Christ.

2. The *mode* of application employed by the Spirit of

God is invariably represented in the scriptures as being by *sprinkling* the blood of Christ: and it is hence called “the *blood of sprinkling*,” and “the *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*,” Heb. xii, 24, and 1 Pet. i, 2.

3. Accordingly, the laws of rhetoric require that there should be a strict analogy between the symbol and the thing adumbrated or represented by the figure. Then, water baptism is the symbol, or shadow, and spiritual baptism is the substance — the reality. Well, spiritual baptism is performed by sprinkling. Therefore, the best laws of language imperiously require that the water in baptism should be applied in the like manner, viz., by *sprinkling* — not immersion.

I now ask, in the name of common sense, what analogy can exist between sprinkling and immersion, in respect to mode? Now, what possible analogy can exist between an immersion of the body under water, and the sprinkling of the heart with the blood of Jesus Christ? None at all. But the strangest inappropriateness—the strangest incongruity!

### § 23. PURIFICATION BY THE HOLY SPIRIT — BAPTISM BY POURING AND SPRINKLING.

“In 1 Cor. xii, 13, the Holy Spirit is directly said to baptize, and in this case all external acts are, of course, excluded, and *purify*, (or regenerate,) is the only appropriate sense. ‘For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body \* \* \* and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.’

“If any shall say that admitting to the Church by the external rite is here meant, I reply, that is never performed by the Spirit, but by man. But this baptism is as much an internal work of the Holy Spirit, as the causing to drink into one Spirit, which is not external, but an internal and real work of the Spirit. But to immerse in water

is not the work of the Holy Spirit, nor is it His work to immerse the mind, but to purify the mind is. Hence, not an external union to the visible Church, but a real union to the true and spiritual body of Christ is here meant, one which is produced by the purification of the mind, not by the immersion of the body. Hence to describe the operation of the Holy Spirit in uniting us to the body of Christ, *purify* (by the application of the blood of Christ by the spirit of God) is adopted — immerse is not.”\* Beecher, p. 28.

But there is still another kind of operation of the Spirit, which is also called in the language of scripture, the baptism of the Holy Ghost; in which Christ Himself is represented as the author. The one “*endues with power from on high*” — the other, as we have seen, purifies and unites the soul to Christ. The one qualifies its subjects, in a supernatural way, to speak with other tongues, to work miracles, and to prophesy, and was confined to the Apostolic age of the Church; the other produces a death to sin, a resurrection to a new life of holiness, and is to *abide* in the church as a permanent blessing. This distinction of spiritual influence must necessarily be kept in view, in order to avoid confusion in consulting the sacred pages. They are both *baptism*, and are both altogether incompatible with the idea of immersion.

The following article on the Baptism of the Spirit, is abridged from C. Taylor’s work entitled “*Apostolic Baptism*. ”

He says, “What think you of the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost? This was not a metaphorical or figurative baptism. It was a real and indisputable subject of the senses, seen by John the Baptist, by the Apostles, in company of the one hundred and twenty, as is generally thought, and by Peter with his brethren, in the instance of Cornelius;

\* See the the subject fully illustrated, Chap. vi.

and not less conspicuous than at the Jordan. It was the subject of John's repeated predictions : Matt. iii, 11, "He shall *baptize* you with the Holy Ghost." It was also the subject of our Lord's repeated prediction : Luke xxiv, 49, 'I send the *promise* of my Father upon you—ye shall be endued with power *from on high.*' Acts i, 5, 'Ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence.' Acts ii, 2, 'And suddenly there *came from Heaven* and APPEARED *unto them* cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them, and they were all *filled* with the Holy Ghost.' The same occurred in the case of Cornelius, Acts x, 44, for Peter says, 'The Holy Ghost FELL on them, *as on us at the beginning.*' Acts xi, 15 and xv, 8, 'God \* \* \* gave them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between them and us, *purifying* their hearts by faith.'

Two words are employed to express their similitude ; one of which *hosper* (like as) denotes a strict and exact similitude, likeness, or conformity. The manner in which this *baptism* was conferred or administered, was not only distinct from *plunging*, or immersion, but it was absolutely INCONSISTENT with that action. *Plunging* was an IMPOSSIBILITY in the administration of this *baptism*.

It is proper to adduce those synonymous words which the sacred Spirit has graciously thought fit to employ, for the purpose of fixing the sense of that word (*baptizo*) which is the immediate subject of investigation. We waive all reference to critics and commentators, however numerous and however positive. We depend on the New Testament alone — on those writers under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who were his instruments in explaining spiritual things by spiritual words. This test is a sort of *experimentum crucis* to false propositions (or doctrines). It has detected many. Let us try it in the case before us :

Luke xxiv, 49, "I *send* the promise of the Father upon you FROM ON HIGH."

"I saw the Spirit DESCENDING FROM HEAVEN, like a dove, and it *abode* upon Him." John i, 32.

"This what was spoken, I will POUR OUT of my Spirit." Acts ii, 2.

"Jesus, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, has SHED FORTH this which ye now see and hear." Acts ii, 35.

"Suddenly there CAME FROM HEAVEN and APPEARED unto them cloven tongues." Acts ii, 17.

"That they might receive the Holy Ghost; for yet He was FALLEN upon none of them." Acts viii, 16.

"Ananias put his hands on Paul, that he might be FILLED with the Holy Ghost." Acts ix, 17.

"God ANOINTED Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost." Acts ix, 38.

"The Holy Ghost FELL on all." Acts x, 44.

"The Holy Ghost FELL on them, even as on us at the beginning." Acts xi, 15.

"They of the circumcision were astonished, because on the Gentiles was POURED OUT the Holy Ghost." Acts x, 45.

"GIVING them the Holy Ghost, even as unto us." Acts xv, 8.

"The Holy Ghost, which He SHED on us abundantly." Titus iii, 6.

"The Holy Ghost SENT DOWN from Heaven." 1 Peter, i, 12.

"SEALED with the Holy Spirit of promise." Eph. i, 13.

These passages give us as synonymous with *baptize*: *sending down, coming, giving, falling, shedding, pouring, sitting or abiding, anointing, filling and sealing*.

In all these synonymous words, there is not *one* that

raises the idea of *plunging*, or even approaches to it. Yet they all refer to *baptism*. “The Apostles shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost,” is the prediction ; the Holy Ghost was *poured out* upon them, is the accomplishment. Even Paul, who was then absent, speaks of the Holy Ghost as being *shed* on him, doubtless at his baptism ; Acts ix, 17. Perhaps, however, the instance of our Lord is the most complete, of *baptism* by the Holy Ghost, and in that we have the very height of certainty ; there was no *plunging* nor anything like it. Although almost all the synonyms meet in His person, as *descending*, *coming*, *falling*, *anointing*, *sitting* or *abiding*, and *sealing*.

We are now advanced to the question, “Did *baptism* by water resemble *baptism* by the Holy Ghost ?—and in what ?” That there must have been *some resemblance* is certain ; and the resemblance must have been *striking* ; for the Apostle Peter, seeing the Holy Ghost *poured out* on the company at Cornelius’s, immediately recollects an allusion to John’s *baptism* by water. The Lord said, “John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.” If there were no resemblance between the two *baptisms*, how came the Apostle’s memory to be refreshed with what he saw ? How came he to lay a stress on his recollection, thus raised and exercised ? This made so strong an impression on his mind, that he adverts to it a long while afterward, Acts xv, 8. If it be asked what he did see ? I answer, he saw the *pouring down* of the Holy Ghost ; for this is the term *expressly used in the history*.

Now try these irreconcilable propositions by the substitution of their synonyms. “John *plunges* you in water ; but ye shall be *plunged* in the Holy Ghost.” Shocking abuse of language and principle ! Try the other : “The Holy Ghost shall be *poured* upon you—*shed* upon you, —*fall* upon you, etc. : as John *pours* water, *sheds* water,

*lets fall* water, etc, upon you." What is offensive in this? What is there contrary to fact? What to decency? What to the analogy of faith? What to the analogy of grammar and language? Even that seemingly inappropriate term, *anointing*, preserves the action though it changes the fluid.

#### § 24. THE LANGUAGE OF PROPHECY — SPRINKLING.

The following is from the pen of an anonymous writer of a number of articles upon the subject of baptism, which appeared in the Banner of Peace:

He says : " *Sprinkling* is the scripture *mode* of Christian *baptism*." \* \* \*

" With a view of sustaining the proposition with which I set out, I offer, as a direct and positive proof, the prophecy of Isaiah (lii, 15) : ' So shall he *sprinkle* many nations: the kings shall shut their mouths at him.' These words are spoken of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are in the context of that passage which the Eunuch was reading when Philip came to him. There is here an allusion to the ancient custom among kings, to admit no one into their presence in their courts, who was not freshly sprinkled by the faithful usher of the palace.' ' At an eastern feast, a person stands near the entrance with a silver vessel (called an aspersorium,) with holes after the manner of a common watering pot, which is full of rose water, or other perfumed liquids, with which he sprinkles the guests as they approach. The object is to show that they are the king's or the great man's guests—they are under his protection.' (Or more probably, the allusion in this passage and that in Ezekiel, is directly to the mode of the Levitical purifications, which were almost all performed by sprinkling, as emblematical of moral purity or cleansing, and as such will apply to both dispensations.)

Thus the Son of God intrusts his Disciples to preach the gospel to the nations, and to sprinkle those who believe, in token of their admission to his presence, and to his protection.—*See Com. Comm.*

“The prophet tells us, ‘The kings shall shut their mouths at him,’ intimating that when the King of kings causes to be sprinkled those who are admitted into his presence in the courts of Zion, the earthly kings shall be ashamed of their baptisms, and practice them no more. This has been fulfilled by that portion of the Christian Church which has firmly adhered to the ancient scripture mode of baptism, while so many have been carried away by immersion, which is a mere imitation of the bathing which, in certain peculiar cases, accompanied ancient baptism. Some immersionists have greatly desired to expunge this passage from the Bible; because, as they allege, it is not found in the Greek translation, (the Septuagint.) This is an attempt to set a translation above the original. If in this instance we give the translation the preference, why should we not do the same in all cases throughout the scriptures? Are immersionists willing to do this? Then why claim the privilege here? No one denies that the words are correctly translated from the original Hebrew. The very desire to expunge the passage, proves its secret force upon the conscience. \*

\* \* We may read the Bible through, from first to last, and we shall not find *immerse* in it, nor any word or phrase that conveys the idea in relation to baptism; but we must be flooded with torrents of inferences, which have no source but human imagination; and when we turn to the very word *sprinkle*, used in reference to this very rite some *fifty* times, and a great number and variety of equivalent phrases, it amounts to nothing!

“As to the objection that this text is found in the Old Testament, it is sufficient to remark, that God was as

true in the days of Isaiah as in the days of Paul ; and there is no evidence that any of the ancient prophecies have been revoked. Many of them remain yet to be fulfilled, and this one is yet fulfilling and still to be fulfilled. After due consideration, then, I offer this ancient prophecy as a clear and positive proof that the mode of baptism under the administration of Christ is *sprinkling*, and if it does not prove that, what does it prove ? How does Christ *sprinkle* the nations if not in baptism ? And by whom if not by those whom he sends out to preach the gospel ? Let the opponent consider and answer these questions before he rejects the proof, and let him notice that there is no inference about it. There is a direct and positive affirmation made on the authority of God.

“ I offer a second direct and positive proof that *sprinkling* is the scripture *mode* of baptism, the unequivocal affirmation in Eze. xxxvi, 24–27. The words determining the mode are in verse 25th : ‘ Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.’ The other verses stand in close connection, and describe the circumstances attending the sprinkling of clean water here foretold. It may be exceedingly profitable particularly to consider all the things here quoted, and to compare them with other scriptures, that we may understand them clearly. It may be remarked then :

1. “ That this passage is a prophecy of what God will do for the children of Israel at the beginning of the millennium. In the words, ‘ *then* will I *sprinkle*, etc., the particle ‘ *then* ’ refers to the time specified in verse 24 : ‘ I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.’ This is the time when God ‘ *will sprinkle clean water* ’ upon them. This prophecy is evidently not yet fulfilled ; for Israel are yet scattered among the nations, and their own land is yet a waste, and their cities are yet

in ruin. But in verse 32, we are told, ‘ In the day that I shall have cleansed you from all your iniquities, I will also cause you to dwell in the cities, and the wastes shall be builded.’ See also verse 36. The cleansing here spoken of, is expressly declared in verse 25, to be one by *sprinkling clean water* upon them ; and the fulfillment is set for the time of the return of Israel to rebuild their ancient cities, and to inhabit again the land which God gave to their fathers. This will take place at the time of the great destructive battle at the commencement of the millennium. (See Eze. xxxviii and xxxix chapters,—especially verses 39, 25, 29.) At this time God will cause the ancient Israelitish nation to be *sprinkled* with clean water, as a symbol of cleansing them ‘*from all their iniquities* ;’ and if the language does not describe Christian baptism, it cannot be described.” \* \* \*

2. If we compare these words with Heb. x, 22, there will be no place left for a single doubt to occupy. Paul says, “Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water.” Here let it be remembered that a cleansing is exactly equal to an effectual washing. Ezekiel speaks of *cleansing*, and Paul of *washing*. Then evidently, they speak of the same thing. Ezekiel has “clean water,” and Paul “pure water,” and the Greek word *katharos*, is the same in both — only a different rendering of the same word. Then again, Ezekiel speaks of a cleansing “from filthiness — from idols, and from all your iniquities,” and Paul speaks of cleansing “from an evil conscience,” and “from *dead works*” to serve the living God. It is plain then that Ezekiel and Paul both meant to describe the same thing ; and they both mention *sprinkling* as the thing which is done to effect what the one calls *cleansing*, and the other calls *washing*.

"Our brethren of the school of immersion often quote the passage from Paul in proof of immersion, and their reliance hangs on the word *wash*; but we see what an idle conceit this is, when Ezekiel describes a cleansing, which is evidently the same with a washing, as done by sprinkling. Baptism is not a literal, but a symbolical cleansing. Few will contend that the very water itself does, or can, cleanse or wash the soul from sin. Then it is a mere symbol of cleansing; and the administration of baptism is an instructive and affecting ceremony, and not a real washing from iniquity and sin. But an examination will prove that all the symbols of cleansing from sin, which God appointed and honored of old, were performed by sprinkling, during the Levitical dispensation; and the same idea is brought down in the baptismal cleansing of the New Testament dispensation.

3. Ezekiel here connects sprinkling, not only cleansing from filthiness, idols, and all iniquity; but according to the style of the New Testament, he also connects it with the gift of a new heart, the putting of a new heart within them; taking away the hard, stony heart; giving them a heart of flesh, causing them to walk obediently in God's statutes in a new life; God becoming their God and Protector, taking them to be His people, and forgiving their sins. No one can fail here to recognize the same things connected with Ezekiel's sprinkling, which are found in the New Testament connected with the ordinance of baptism. The sprinkling here foretold, is placed in striking connection with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as it is in the New Testament. The words, "And I will put my Spirit within you," cannot be misunderstood. How strikingly like the words of Pentecost! "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." Christ fulfilled the promise of baptizing with the Holy Ghost, by filling His disciples with His Divine Spirit; and Ezekiel foretells

the sprinkling of the Jews in connection with putting the Divine Spirit within them. What is the difference between putting the Spirit of God within a people, and filling them with the Holy Ghost? Indeed, the whole thing, as presented by Ezekiel, is just equal to a prophecy of a second Pentecost to the Israelites; whereas, as surely as God's Word is true, they will be sprinkled with clean water, to wash away in the scriptural sense of baptism. Then, we ask, what will this sprinkling be for, unless to baptize them? And if God will cause them to be sprinkled with clean water, to wash away their "filthiness, their idols, and all their iniquity," then it is perfectly clear that sprinkling is the scriptural mode of baptism; because God will certainly not baptize in an unscriptural manner. But, if sprinkling will be God's mode of baptism at the beginning of the millennium, there can be no reasonable doubt but it is now, and ever has been, the proper mode.

4. "I remark, that the 'clean water' of Ezekiel's cleansing, and the 'pure water' of Paul's washing, both allude, most evidently, to the ancient 'water of purification for sin,' which was also called the 'water of sprinkling,' the 'water of separation,' etc. The same word in its verbal and nominal inflections, is used in the Septuagint, in the text from Ezekiel, and in the writings of Moses, where the 'water of purification' is mentioned, and by the Apostle Paul, in the ninth and tenth chapters of Hebrews. It was called the 'water of purification,' or 'pure water,' because it was appointed as a pre-eminent symbol of cleansing from sin and all uncleanness. In its preparation, the ashes of a red heifer were chosen with special reference to the great atonement. God, by the mouth of a prophet and an Apostle, presents us with a view of the baptism of the New Testament, in the express words and distinctive and specific form of *sprinkling*. The water of

purification is the pure water that washes our bodies ; and by the express requirement of law, (as seen in the above cited passages,) it could be applied in no other mode but *sprinkling*. And for this there is a reason ; for in no other mode could it symbolize the atonement, which really cleanses the soul from guilt. This very identical sprinkling of the pure water in Num. 19, Paul calls, Heb. ix, 10, 13, one of the *divers washings*, or *baptisms* of the former dispensation ; and exhorts believers to the same mode of washing their bodies, in drawing near to God, in full assurance of faith ; and Ezekiel, using the same word *katharos*, tells us the same sprinkling is to go on through the dispensation of the Spirit in the latter day glory.

In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established ; and are they not here ? And now, I ask in the name of faith, reason and common sense,— in the name of God and the Bible, I ask— what is the use of troubling the world with inferences of immersion from John in Jordan; when we have the express testimony of two inspired witnesses—a prophet and an Apostle— both declaiming in so many words, that *sprinkling* ‘pure water’ is New Testament baptism.” —

#### § 25. USE OF THE PREPOSITIONS — SPRINKLING.

We are able to construct an argument in favor of *sprinkling* as the primitive mode of baptism, upon the use of the *prepositions* in connection with the word *baptizo*, and its synonym, *katharizo*.

There are certain prepositions employed, both in the New Testament and in the writings of the Fathers, in immediate connection with *baptizo* and *katharizo*,, when speaking of the ordinance of baptism, which require the sense *purify*, and altogether preclude the possibility of the idea *immerse* from being at all in the mind of the writers.

They are dia, en, ek, apo, etc. We find baptism, dia, *by* fire, *by* tears, *by* martyrdoms, *by* blood, *by* water. Not immersion, en, *in* fire, *in* tears, *in* martyrdom, etc. And we find baptism, apo or ek, *from*, or *by* the Spirit, or water, or fire. Not immersion, en, *in* the Spirit, or *in* water, or *in* fire. Several of the prepositions follow baptizo, or katharizo, and make good sense and good grammar, while but few will follow the words *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*, (perhaps only two or three — en, eis,) without a harshness, or even a contradiction of terms.

It is admitted on all sides, that a great deal of latitude is required in the use of the Greek prepositions, and to arrive at the sense of any one, we are guided mainly by the governing word with which it is connected.

*Dia, by, through.* It denotes a cause of almost any kind, and readily interchanges with other prepositions ; especially with en, when used in the instrumental or causative sense.

*En, in, with, by.* It is often taken in the instrumental or causative sense, and is equivalent to dia. It occurs in Matt. iii, 11, “ I indeed baptize you, (en) with water ; but he shall baptize you ( en ) with the Holy Ghost, and ( en ) with fire.” Now, if the doctrine of immersion were true, en would be correctly rendered *in*, or *into*, which is probably the more common meaning of this particle : “ But the latter clause of this verse shows the impropriety of such a rendering here, for the baptism of the Holy Ghost is clearly an application of the Divine Spirit to the soul of the believer. And immersion in the Holy Ghost is such a palpable absurdity, that but few will contend for it.

“ How simple and natural the sentiment of John : ‘ I indeed purify you *with* water, but He shall purify you *with* the Holy Spirit.,’ I perform an external and symbolical rite, by which the body is cleansed with water ;

but He shall perform a higher cleansing, or that by which the mind itself is purified by the Spirit of God. And how harsh, how forced, how unnatural, to say, I immerse you *in* the Holy Spirit. In fine, such a use of language to denote purification, is entirely foreign to all the laws of the human mind.

“Indeed, so much is the force of this felt, that, in this part of the antithesis, many resort to a new modification of the idea, and maintain that it means to ‘imbue largely, to overwhelm with Divine influences.’ It would then read, ‘I indeed immerse you *in* water; but He shall imbue you largely with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ But this destroys the whole symmetry of the antithesis. John does not mean to say, I imbue you largely with water; but either I immerse you *in* water, or, I cleanse you *with* water; and which ever sense we adopt in one part of the antithesis, we ought to retain in the other part of it.

“But when the agent is the Holy Spirit, the object the human spirit, the means spiritual, and the end purity, the sense immerse is out of the question. Purify, then, in any view of the subject, must here be the sense;” and the instrumental or causative sense of *en*, in this passage, as equivalent to *dia*, is fully justified.

The fact that *en* here follows *baptizo*, and that in itself, it can be rendered either *by* or *in*, emboldened Dr. Carson to claim that the sense is immerse *in* water and *in* the Holy Ghost. Against this view Eusebius of Cesarea expressly testifies. He first declares that purification *with* or *by* the Spirit ( Isa. iv, 4,) does not differ in sense from baptism *with* or *by* the Spirit, as used by John, and then adds: “In the one case, ( Isa. iv, 4,) fiery words, powerfully affecting them, wrought in them a purification from sin. In like manner, it is said that the Saviour would purify, *baptize*, not *with* water, but *with* the Holy Ghost,

and *with* fire." Nothing can be more explicit. He thus removes the ambiguity of en after baptizo, and gives to the dative, ( case of the noun ) preceded by en, the same causative sense which is indicated by dia, and the genitive, ( case of the noun.) Thus are our translators defended for rendering the passage, "I indeed baptize with water, but he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost," instead of immerse *in* water, and *in* the Holy Ghost, as Dr. Carson claims.

Again : "The causative sense of *en* is no less clearly established by 1 Cor. xii, 13. *By* ( en ) one Spirit have we all been baptized into one body." "In all the context of this passage, the Spirit is represented as an active, intelligent, Divine person, by whom wisdom, faith, and spiritual gifts are bestowed ; and *en* and *dia* are interchanged as equivalents. To one is given, *dia*, by the Spirit the word of wisdom ; to another, gifts of healing, *en*, by the same Spirit. All these things worketh that one and self-same Spirit, dividing to every one as He will." After this comes the assertion, "By one Spirit have we all been baptized into one body ;" that is, of necessity, purified, and then united in one spiritual body ; not immersed *into* one body — immersion *into* a body is absurd."

Apo, *from*, and ek, *out of*, *from by*, are directly opposed to the idea of immersion. Apo occurs in the baptism of Paul — Acts xxii 16 — "Arise, and be baptized, and, apolousai, *wash away* thy sins." And in 1 Peter, iii, 21, Peter says, "Baptism is not, apothesis, the *putting away* the filth of the flesh," etc. And, Rev. i, 5 : "Unto Him that washed us, *apo*, *from* our sins," etc. And, Sirach, xxxi, 25 : "He that is baptized, *apo*, *from* a dead body," etc. In all these passages the sense, to purify, which is signified by baptism, suits the preposition *apo*, but immerse does not. It is perfectly natural to speak of *putting*

*off, washing away sins, and of washing us from our sins, and of purifying or cleansing from a dead body ; but not of immersing away sins, or of immersing from our sins, or from a dead body.*

I will here add, that Basil, one of the Fathers, in commenting on Isa. iv, 4, employs *ek* after *baptisma*, a preposition at war with the idea immerse. For we are not immersed (*ek*,) *out of*, or *from* water, but (*en*) *in* water ; but we are purified (*ek*) *by* the water, and (*ek*) *by* the Spirit ; *ek* denoting that from which the purification proceeds.

— *Extracts from Dr. Beecher.*

#### § 26 BAPTISM OF BLOOD, OF FIRE, OF TEARS, AND OF THE TRUTH.

The Fathers also speak of a baptism *by* blood, or martyrdom, of a baptism *by* tears, of a baptism *by* fire, and of a baptism *by* the truth ; all of which are in open opposition to the idea of immersion.

1. The baptism of blood alludes to the sufferings and death of Christ, and to the sufferings and death of the martyrs. The Fathers apply the word baptism merely to the act of making an atonement *by shedding blood* ; even when no one is spoken of, either as sprinkled by it, or immersed in it, and when the only external act is totally at war with the idea immerse. In cases of this kind, no sense is possible but katharismos, ( purification,) which is the established sacrificial term for an atonement, as we have already seen. Christ shed His blood for sin, and this is called katharismos in the Word of God — Heb. i, 3. Now, if they call the mere act of shedding his blood a baptism, it is totally impossible that it should be taken in any except the sacrificial sense.

Oigen, speaking of Luke xii, 50 : “ But I have a baptism to be baptized with,” says, “ Our probation

extends, not only to strife, but to the shedding of blood ; for Christ, whom we follow, shed His blood for our redemption, in order that we might leave this world washed in our own blood. For it is the baptism of blood alone which renders us more pure than the baptism of water. Nor do I say this presumptuously, but the Scripture authorizes it, by the statement of our Lord to His disciples: “I have a baptism to be baptized with, which ye know not.” You see, therefore, that He called the shedding of His blood a baptism.” He also uses dia (by,) after baptisma, as do others, so as to render impossible the idea immersion. The perfect *baptism by* the mystery of His sufferings.’ And so does John of Damascus: “The baptism *by* blood and martyrdom, by which Christ purified Himself for us.” And, again : “The baptism by martyrdom and blood.”

As to the case of the martyrs, it is worthy of remark, “That the religion of Christ began with a solemn act of martyrdom—even that of the Son of God. Both by His example, and also by His spirit-stirring words, He provided powerful motives to excite His disciples to meet death in its most terrific form. These motives were not only effectual in multitudes of instances, but the minds of the early Christians were so deeply affected, and so highly excited on the subject, that soon they went even to the extreme of undue eagerness for such a death. And this disposition was increased by a false construction put on the words of Paul; ‘I am ready to be offered.’ ‘Yea, and if I be offered up.’ Also, of the words of Christ, ‘Can you be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized?’ which they understood as : Can ye be purified with the purification wherewith I am purified ? and regarded as an inquiry, whether they were ready to be purified in their own blood, as He was in His ? Hence they ascribed to the death of a martyr a kind of atoning power,

and spoke of it as a purification, or baptism, in the sacrificial sense. And hence, too, the universal idea of a bloody baptism was, that the martyr was purified or purged from sin by his own blood. Now the correctness of their views is not the question. They were evidently false. Our only inquiry is : In what language were they expressed ? The answer is as before ; baptizo and baptisma are freely used to denote the act of purifying, or purging from sin, by the shedding of blood ; and that in such circumstances, that all attempts to introduce the idea of immersion are vain.

2. In speaking of the baptism of fire, the Fathers regarded it, not as immersion, but as a purification or purgation, and from this use the idea of a future purgatory, doubtless came. A few regarded the fire spoken of in the words, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," as referring to future punishment, as some do even now. But others of them regarded it as the purifying fire of the Holy Spirit. Others believed in a literal fire of purification after death, particularly Origen. In Hom. 24, on Luke iii, 16, he speaks of Jesus as purifying in a river of fire, each one, who after death and before entering Heaven, needs to be purged. In Hom. 2, on Jer. he says, "Therefore Jesus also baptizes with the Holy Spirit and with fire. Not because He baptizes the same person with the Holy Spirit and with fire, but because he who is holy is baptized with the Holy Spirit ; but he who turns to sin after professing his faith and submitting to God, is purified (baptized) by the torments of fire. Blessed is he who has received the purification of the Holy Spirit, and does not need the purification (baptism) of fire. Miserable is he, and deserving of tears, who, after the purification of the Spirit, needs to be purified (baptized) with fire." Again : "The sinner who needs the baptism of fire, who is purged by burning." And

again, “That the fire of Gehenna may purify (baptize) him by torments, whom neither the Apostolical doctrines nor the evangelical truths purified, according to that which is written: ‘I will purify thee with fire, in order to make thee pure.’” Clearly they had in mind the words of Malachi, “He is like a refiner’s fire,” and “He shall *purify* and *purge*.” Taking the word *baptizo* in this sense, there is no fact clearer than that the idea immerse was entirely foreign to the minds of the Fathers, when speaking of the baptism by fire.”

3. In speaking of the baptism of tears, the Fathers regard it as a purification *by tears*, and not as an immersion *in tears*. The very nature of the case shows that it must have been so, and the language of the Fathers proves that the purifying power of tears did not depend on having a quantity sufficient for an immersion. Says Nilus, “The tears of prayer,” not a flood, or river, or ocean of tears — “the tears of prayer is a good wash-basin of the soul.” For this use of *louter* (wash-basin) see sec. 16, and the idea there given of washing the hands of the soul. So Gregory Nyss calls tears “a domestic washing-place, and fountain of your own, by means of which you can wash off the pollution of your soul.” *Aponipto*, as no one can deny, never denotes immersion, but commonly the washing of hands and feet. From the nature of the case then, as well as from the language of the Fathers, we are certain that they regarded the baptism of tears, not as an immersion, but as a purification.

4. The Fathers also speak of the baptism of the truth, and consequently regarded it as a purifying agent; and as such, as standing in intimate connection with the ordinance of baptism, and as indicative of moral purity; but not of immersion, which of itself, is as much indicative of pollution, as it is of purification. And as I am not provided with quotations directly from the Fathers

upon this part of the subject, I will merely give the substance of their views, as they incidentally appear in their writings ; which by the by, are more orthodox in this case than usual.

One of the main texts upon the subject is Eph. v, 25-27, where the Apostle represents Christ as loving the Church, and giving himself for it, “That he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water,” *by the word*, etc. This beautiful passage is commonly viewed as alluding to the external washing of baptism, by the formal habit of mind inseparable from the belief of immersion, though the washing is expressly declared to be *by the word*; and the spiritual signification of *water* is entirely overlooked, though God has expressly used it as a symbol of truth : “I will sprinkle clean *water* upon ye, and ye shall be clean,” etc. That purification was the primary idea in the minds of both the Prophet and the Apostle, is clear from these texts themselves ; and that the purity desired was to be effected by the belief of the truth, is also evident, from other passages. The Saviour said to the Disciples, (John viii, 32) : “And ye shall know the *truth*, and the *truth* shall make you free.”

A lively writer \* remarks upon this subject : “Neither the Church nor the world is taught to expect any spiritual good, but through the medium of spiritual truth. The truth occupies a prominent place in the intercession of Christ for his people, when he prayed, ‘Sanctify them through thy *truth*, thy *word* is *truth* ;’ and the Holy Spirit describes Christians as being ‘begotten by the word of truth ;’ as ‘born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God ;’ and as having *purified* their souls in obeying the *truth*.’”

In this view of the baptism of the truth, we are entirely at a loss to discover any idea of immersion whatever.

\*Dr. Jenkyn, of England.

True there is a “washing of water,” and a “sprinkling of clean water,” brought to view ; but that very washing, that very sprinkling, is effected *by the word or truth of God*, which liveth and abideth forever. But there can be no possible immersion in the truth.

Thus we see that the Fathers speak of the sufferings and blood of Christ, and the martyrs, of a purgation by fire, and the affusion of tears, and the reception of the truth or word of God ; and that they regarded them all as baptisms ; but these “divers baptisms,” from the very nature of the case, stand diametrically opposed to all idea of immersion. The prevailing idea with the Fathers is that of a purification in every instance ; but an immersion in blood, in fire, in tears, or in the truth, is a palpable absurdity.—*Extracted mostly from Beecher, pp. 63–68, 77–79.*

## THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER V.

#### HISTORICAL FACTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

This chapter is extracted chiefly from the able work of Dr. Peters. The former one brings the direct argument upon the mode of baptism to a close ; but the historical facts and illustrations contained in this, drawn from the practice of the Apostles and early Christian Fathers, go far to strengthen and confirm the argument for the mode of baptism by *sprinkling*.

" All the questions," says Dr. Peters, " that have been raised as to the *mode* of baptism, resolve themselves into this one : Is the water to be applied to the person, or is the person to be applied to the water ? Shall the water be *poured* or *sprinkled* on the person, or must the person be *dipped* or *immersed* into the water ? This is the question ; and I maintain that the applying of the water to the person is the only mode of baptism, as a religious ordinance made known in the scriptures. My position is that the Bible invariably teaches that in the administration of baptism to persons, both Jewish and Christian, the water was applied to the subject of the ordinance, the person. Some of the proofs of this will now be adduced."

— *Peters*, p. 59.

### § 27. NATURE AND DESIGN OF JOHN'S BAPTISM.—BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

"Having in a preceding section, referred to the baptism of John, I think it proper to remark here, that, besides the Jewish rites of purification, other baptisms somewhat peculiar had been introduced, and were well known to Christ and his Disciples, before the institution of Christian baptism by our Saviour.

"To say nothing here of the Jewish proselyte baptism,\* which I shall have occasion to consider more at large hereafter, the baptism of John had already been commenced and concluded. The nature of this baptism, therefore, should be considered, to show the prevalent use of the word *baptizo*, at the time of our Saviour's last command to his Disciples. I do not now allude to the *mode* of John's baptism, which will be discussed in the next section. But it is important for the reader to have in his mind some accurate views of the distinctive character of this baptism.

"Let it be understood, then, that John's baptism was not *Christian* baptism. John began to preach and baptize six months before Christ entered upon his public ministry. His baptism, therefore, cannot be supposed to be Christian baptism, without involving the absurdity of supposing that the initiating ordinance of the Christian system existed six months previous to Christianity itself. And if this were so, it would prove that Christ did not institute Christian baptism, which is also absurd; for the law of Moses did not end in John, but in Christ. The legal dispensation, indeed, was in full force during all the

\* "Whatever may have been the mode of the Jewish proselyte baptism, it should be remembered that this baptism was a mere usage which had grown up, and was not an institution of the Mosaic law. Nor is it named in the scriptures." — *Peters.*

time of John's ministry, and the personal ministry of Christ, and came to its close only in the death and resurrection of the Saviour, after which, as we have seen, Christian baptism was instituted.

"Again : John baptized his Disciples on the profession of *repentance*.

Christian baptism is properly administered to adults, only in the profession of *regeneration*, (Acts xix, 4 ; ii, 38 ; Gal. iii, 27.) The faith which John required, was faith in a Saviour yet to come ; and this was the faith of all the Jews, who believed the prophecies of their own scriptures. So Paul declares (Acts xix, 4,) "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, *that they should believe on him, who should come after him, on Jesus Christ.*" But John did not baptize in the name of Christ, nor in the name of the Holy Ghost. If he had, he would have given his Disciples appropriate instruction, and certainiy would have taught the people to know that he was not himself the Christ. Yet it is said, (Luke iii, 15) : "All men mused in their hearts, of John, whether *he* were the Christ or not." And after John had finished his ministry, having baptized a large proportion of the people of Judea, our Saviour propounded to his Disciples the following question (Matt. xvi, 13, 14) : "Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am ?" And they said, "Some say that thou art John the Baptist : some Elias : and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets."

Here was a degree of prevailing ignorance of Christ, quite inconsistent with the supposition that John had baptized in his name. Indeed, John himself appears not to have known the Saviour's person, until he had been several months baptizing "with the baptism of repentence." Hence previous to the Saviour's baptism, he expressly declares, "I knew him not," John i, 32, 34.

And as to any recognition of the Holy Ghost in John's baptism, some whom he had baptized, themselves affirmed, (Acts xtx, 2, 3): "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." So Paul baptized them "in the name of the Lord Jesus," paying no regard to their having been baptized by John, (Acts xix, 5.) This surely he would not have done, if the baptism of John had been Christian baptism.

"It appears then, that John's baptism was finished before the institution of Christian baptism, and that it was different in its design and in its distinctive character. It took place not under Christ, but under the *Jewish dispensation*. That dispensation continued in full force until the death of Christ. Then the veil of the temple was rent in twain, the great sacrifice for sin was offered, and the typical sacrifices ceased. Then Christ blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances, that was against us, and took it out of the way, "nailing it to the cross." Yet the baptism of John was not strictly a Jewish ordinance, but rather a divine ordinance independent of Judaism. It was not of the law, but was a specific institution for a special purpose; and being peculiar in its design, it was of only temporary application. It was an ordinance for the time being, preparatory to the ministry of Christ. Like the preaching of John, and his ministry in general, it was to 'prepare the way of the Lord'; and like the ordinances strictly Jewish, it was done away in Christ.

"It may be remarked also here, that Christ himself, as well as his forerunner, lived under the old dispensation, and was a strict observer of the institutions of Moses. 'He was made under the law,' and all that was done in the Church, previous to the Saviour's death, belonged properly to that dispensation. So the baptism of the Saviour by John was not Christian baptism; that is, it was not the baptism which he himself afterwards insti-

tuted as a Christian sacrament. Nor was he baptized in his own name. His receiving baptism at the hands of John, was evidently one of his acts of submission to the ordinances then existing in the Church, whether strictly Jewish, or appropriate to the ministry of his forerunner. And so when ‘John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me ?’ he said, ‘Suffer it to be so now ; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness,’ that is, to fulfill every *ordinance*. Matt. iii, 14, 15.

“Nor did this baptism of Christ, by John, partake of the nature of John’s baptism, as administered to others. It was not a baptism ‘unto repentance ;’ for Christ had no sin to repent of. It was not, as is the case with all others, preparatory to the reception of the Saviour ; for he was himself the Saviour. But the rite here administered was peculiar and appropriate to its adorable Subject.

“Christ was now in his thirtieth year,—the age at which by the appointment of God, the priests under the law, were to undertake the duties of their office. He was a ‘High Priest,’ and was about to enter upon his public ministry. This baptism, in his case, was not, it could not have been a symbol of cleansing, but of priestly consecration. So Christ exercised the office of a priest during his personal ministry. It was in this character that he purged the temple ; and when the Chief Priests and Elders demanded of him, by what authority he did these things, he appealed to the baptism of John, for a vindication of his authority, Matthew xxi, 12, 23–27. If the Jews had acknowledged the baptism of John to have been from heaven, he would doubtless have silenced them by saying, ‘It was by that baptism that I was consecrated to my priestly office ;’ for, ‘among the Jews, what was done by an accredited prophet of

the Lord, was both authoritative and irreversible.”\*—*Peters*, pp. 51, 57.

### § 28. MODE OF JOHN’S BAPTISM.—SPRINKLING.

“John baptized *with* water, and not *into* water; that is, he applied the water to the subject, and not the subject to the water. So he declares (John i, 31): ‘Therefore am I come baptizing *with* water.’ And, (Matt. iii, 11,) ‘I indeed baptize you *with* water—but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost.’ To evade the force of this expression, it has been contended by some Baptist writers, that the Greek particle *en*, here rendered with, ought to be translated *into*, which is perhaps the more common meaning of this particle. But the latter clause of the verse shows the impropriety of such a rendering here; for the baptism of the Holy Ghost is clearly an application of the Divine Spirit to the soul of the believer. It would be a plain perversion of the passage to say, ‘He shall immerse you *into* the Holy Ghost.’ So John says, ‘I indeed baptize you *with* water, as Christ shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost.’ See § 25.

“But if we were not so emphatically told, as we are in these passages, that John baptized *with* water, the impossibility of his having immersed the immense multitude that came to him, proves that he must have baptized them in some other way; and the proofs are strong and conclusive, not only that he did not apply the person to the water, but that he did apply the water to the person, by some mode of *sprinkling*.

“Let the reader examine the subject of John’s baptism as it is presented in the New Testament, and see if we are not justified in this statement. Matthew says (iii, 5, 6): ‘There went out to him, Jerusalem and all Judea,

\*Hibbard on Baptism, p. 4.

and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, \* confessing their sins.' Mark says (i, 5) : 'There went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were *all* baptized of him.' Luke says (iii, 21) : 'And when *all the people* were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus himself, being baptized and praying, the heaven was opened,' etc.

"Now the population of the city and region here described, as might be proved by credible historical testimony, was probably not less than *six millions*. In the days of king David, a thousand years before Christ, there were in Israel and Judah, *one million and three hundred thousand* 'valiant men that drew the sword.' 2 Sam. xxiv, 9. And this census was exclusive of the tribes of Levi and Benjamin, and of the people under twenty years old. Reckoning five persons to every warrior in Israel and Judah, which is a moderate estimate, the whole population at that time was more than *six millions*. And notwithstanding the frequent wars of the Jews, by which multitudes were slain, there is, in their strong aversion to other nations, and their love of their own country, which confined them mostly to Palestine, much to render it probable that the population was not materially diminished in the time of our Saviour. The testimony of Josephus confirms the probability that the population of the holy land was as large as in the days of David.

"It is highly probable also, that a large proportion of this population were baptized by John. The representations of the three Evangelists, which we have already quoted, show this. And then it should be considered

\* "The expression *in Jordan*, (*en to Jordane*) is often quoted by Baptists to prove that John's baptism was by *immersion*. But if this proves immersion in the Jordan, a similar expression (Mark i, 4,) proves *immersion in the wilderness*; for it is there said, *John was baptizing in the desert, en le desert*." — Peters.

that John was the predicted Messenger sent to prepare the way of Christ. He was sent, not to any party of the Jews, but to the whole Jewish nation. All parties went out to see and hear him. There seems to have been no great division concerning him, as there was concerning Christ. His career was brief and popular. Hence our Saviour testifies of him, to the Jews (John v, 35): ‘He was a burning and a shining light; and ye were willing, for a season, to rejoice in his light.’

“But, to be within bounds, respectable and learned writers, as Hibbard and Kurtz, have supposed, that if John baptized only one-half of the people of Palestine, say, *three millions*, could he have done this by immersion?

“Let it be considered that John’s ministry continued only about nine months, when he was cast into prison by Herod, the Tetrarch, and soon after beheaded, at the request of a dancing girl. He had been engaged in his ministry only about six months, when he baptized the Saviour, and continued about three months after that event. And it is easy to show that he could not have employed the whole of that time in baptizing.

“Suppose then, that John baptized, say *three millions* of people in nine months. Deduct *forty-three* sabbaths, in which, according to the Jewish observance of the Sabbath, it was unlawful for him to baptize, and there are left in all, *two hundred and thirty-one days*, in which he was perhaps engaged in this service. Now if we suppose him to have stood in the water, and baptized by *immersion*, six hours every day, he must have immersed *two thousand, one hundred and sixty-four* every hour, *thirty-six* every minute, and *more than one* every two seconds!

“But the supposition that John baptized so large a proportion of the people as one half, is perhaps extravagant. The expressions of the Evangelists referred to, do not prove that he baptized one half, any more than that

he baptized the whole population. We are not authorized, therefore, to fix upon any particular proportion. These expressions, however, and the whole history of John's ministry, are sufficient to show that the multitude whom he baptized was very great. If we suppose it to have been only *one twelfth part* of the population, still it was five hundred thousand, which would require him to baptize *three hundred and sixty-one* every hour, and *six* every minute.

"For John, therefore, to have performed his baptism by immersion, was plainly impossible. And it is in vain to say that he accomplished his ministry, in this thing, by miraculous power; for we are told, that when Christ was afterwards at the very place 'where John at first baptized,' 'many resorted to him, and said, John did no miracle, but all things that John spake of this man were true.' John x, 41.

"It is clear then, that he could not have *immersed* all the people that came to him. Yet it is expressly said, that he *baptized them all*. It may be asked whether it was not equally impossible for John to baptize them, according to our mode, that is, by sprinkling them *one* by *one*? Our reply is, that it was not at all necessary to suppose that he baptized them singly. The Jewish law did not require this; and John made no innovation upon the Jewish rites. He simply employed the customary ceremony of purification, for the purposes of his own ministry. Hence the Jews found no fault with his *mode* of baptism; and the only imaginable reason is, that he conformed to their own usage. He doubtless took a bunch of hyssop, and made it sufficiently large for his purpose, and dipped it in water, and sprinkled the people, as they came to him, in large numbers at a time. This, we have seen, was the Jewish mode of purification, which Paul calls baptism. See § 15, 1.

"It is manifest, also, that the vast multitude that collected around John, went out to hear him preach. They had no thought of being *baptized*, until they were convicted, and applied for baptism on the spot. Hence we are told, John i, 25, that the Pharisees asked him, "Why *baptizest* thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that Prophet? They went out, of course, without any change of raiment. No one surely will suppose that they were immersed, with their clothes on, in these circumstances, and there is no intimation that they were denuded (divested of their garments) for this purpose. If, then, we had not been so pointedly informed, as we are, that John baptized this immense multitude, not *into* water, but *with* water, it would still be inconceivable that they were *immersed*.

"But it is said, John iii, 23, that 'John was baptizing in Enon, near to Salem, because there was *much water* there,' 'Why was this?' say our Baptist brethren. 'Why did John choose a place where there was *much water*, if he performed his baptism by *sprinkling*?' The question would be of some importance, if it had been said that John was at Enon for the convenience of baptizing. But no such thing is intimated in Scripture. The circumstances were these: John had been baptizing 'in Bathabara beyond Jordan,' John i, 28. All his earlier baptisms had been performed there. Why did he leave that broad river, and go to Enon? The Evangelist, according to our translation, says, it was 'because there was *much water* there.' But there was more water in the Jordan. If then, he consulted only the convenience of baptizing by immersion, there was no gain by his removal. Surely he was as well accommodated in this respect, on the banks of the Jordan, as he could have been at Enon.

"But there was another reason for his removal, amply sufficient to account for his change of places. The Jordan

is a turbid stream. The water of it is unfit for drink or culinary purposes, until it has stood several hours in vessels and settled. But the waters of Enon were pure rivulets or streams, flowing from a single fountain or spring. The place has been identified by modern travelers, and it is plainly seen to have furnished far better accommodation than the region of the Jordan, for the encampment and comfort of the thousands and tens of thousands that attended the ministry of John. And the geography of the place, has thrown light upon the original expression, here translated *much water*. It is *pola hudata*, which literally signifies, not *much water*, but *many waters*, or streams. And the reason is now plain why John resorted thither. He was perpetually attended by the greatest multitude that ever assembled around a human being for instruction. Had they no use for these *many waters* excepting for the ordinances of baptism? Were not those pure and healthful waters a great and almost indispensable convenience for drinking, and for culinary and other purposes? And did not their camels, and horses, and asses need water? Just such locations are selected by those who have experience in camp meetings in our own country. Pure and abundant springs, or streams of running water, is regarded as indispensable for the comfort of the people and their beasts of burthen, without the slightest reference to baptism in any mode. This passage, therefore, proves nothing as to the mode of John's baptism. It leaves us free to presume, that he baptized in Enon, as he did elsewhere, not *into* water, but *with* water. Doubtless he applied the water to the person, and not the person to the water." *Peters, pp. 68, 77.*

### § 29. BAPTISM OF THREE THOUSAND ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.—SPRINKLING.

"We come now to matters of fact and history, as to the mode in which the Apostles actually did administer Christian baptism, in obedience to the Saviour's last command.

"The first account of the administration of baptism, after the ascension of the Saviour, is that recorded Acts ii, 41, where it is said 'They that gladly received His word, were *baptized*: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.' We have already noticed the prophesy of Isaiah, (lii, 15,) in fulfillment of which we suppose the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost, must have been received into the Christian Church by *sprinkling*. But setting aside the prophesy altogether, and considering the events of the day of Pentecost historically, we are led to the same conclusion.

"The Apostles had no place for the *immersion* of such a multitude as were there baptized. The Jordan was sixteen or eighteen miles distant, and at that season of the year, (June,) the brook Kedron was nearly or quite dry.\* And if it was not dry, a common sewer pouied all the filth of the northern portion of the city into it, rendering it wholly unfit to be used as a place of *immersion*. Where, then, could the Apostles have baptized the three thousand converts by *immersion*? These baptisms appear to have been performed on the spot, as well as on 'the same day' of their conversion. Where was the water for their *immersion*? There was no river nor brook to which they could resort in so short a time; and there were only two

\* "This brook flowed along the east side of the city, was at best but a turbid and unimportant stream, and was always dry in summer. Jahn informs us, its channel is dry except in winter."—*Jahn sce. 19, p. 20.*

public pools or bathing places in Jerusalem, Bethesda and Siloam. The latter was at the foot of Mount Moriah, three-quarters of a mile distant from where the Apostles were assembled ; and we have no account of their marching off to it, with the thousands that heard them.

"Bethesda was near at hand, on the north-east of the temple, but it was used daily for the cleansing of sacrifice, and the blood and offals of the sacrifice and temple were washed into it, which, some have imagined may have imparted to the water its healing virtues. At least it must have been unfit for a place of immersion. It was also in the hands of the priests, the avowed and mortal enemies of Christ and His Disciples. They ridiculed the transactions of the day, and said, 'these men are full of new wine.' They surely would not have willingly given up the pool of Bethesda to the Apostles, to be used as a place of Christian baptism. It is probable, also, that both Siloam and Bethesda were of insufficient dimensions to allow the eleven apostles to use them at the same time for the purpose of immersion.

"The implacable opposition of the priests and of the Jews in general, must also have prevented their making use of the washing lavers of the temple for this purpose. Nor can it be supposed that they were admitted to the bathing places in private houses for immersion in such vast numbers. For, besides the inconvenience and improbability of this, on many accounts, those bathing places were only to be found in the houses of the rich and honorable, very few of whom at that time, were disposed to befriend the cause of Christ. Where, then, we ask again, could the Apostles have immersed the three thousand on the day of Pentecost ?

"But the difficulties of supposing that the converts on that day were all *immersed*, are still greater, if we consider that, after the close of Peter's sermon, there were but

about five hours of the day remaining. Yet the account states that they were added to the Church ‘the same day.’ But to have immersed them all in five hours, each of the Apostles must have immersed more than *fifty* persons every hour, and more than *five* persons every six minutes ! This, I need not say, would have been impossible. But if the Apostles performed the rite of baptism by *sprinkling*, according to the prevalent mode of purifying among the Jews, the three thousand were baptized in five hours with comparative ease.

“ It is said indeed, that the seventy Disciples (Luke x, 1) might have aided on this occasion, and thus rendered possible the baptism of three thousand by *immersion*, in the time specified. But it is nowhere said in scripture, that the seventy were commissioned to baptize. It is certain that they were not with the Apostles at the time they received the Saviour’s last command. Only the eleven were then present, (Matt. xxviii, 16.) And the account of the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii,) gives us to understand very explicitly, that the seventy, if they were present at all, were there only as spectators, taking no prominent part in the ministry. It says that ‘Peter, standing up with the *eleven*, lifted up his voice.’ Why are not the *seventy* mentioned, if they also took part in the services ? The truth is, there is no evidence or intimation, that they were there ; much less that they took part in the baptism of the three thousand. Nor is there any degree of probability, that any others were authorized to take part in the administration of those baptisms. Only ten days had intervened since the Apostles had received their own commission from the Saviour ; and we have no account of their having ordained any person to the work of the ministry during that time. On the contrary, we are assured that the Saviour had commanded them to suspend the exercise of their Apostolic functions

until the descent of the Holy Ghost, which took place on the day of Pentecost. (Luke xxiv, 49; Acts i, 7, 8.) The difficulties, therefore, in the way of *immersion*, on this occasion, remain insurmountable, and all the probabilities are in favor of the conclusion, that the three thousand were baptized by *sprinkling*.

"The next account of the administration of this ordinance, in the time of the Apostles, is the baptism of Simon and many others, both men and women, by Philip the Evangelist, in Samaria. But there are no circumstances here which indicate the mode. It is simply said, 'They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.' (Acts viii, 12, 13, 16.) — *Peters*, pp. 84, 89.

#### § 30. BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH AND OF CHRIST — SPRINKLING — THE GREEK PARTICLES TRANSLATED *into* AND *out of*.

"The next occurrence of baptism was that of the Eunuch (Acts viii, 38, 39): 'And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up *out of* the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, and the Eunuch saw him no more.' There is one other passage, where a similar expression occurs, (Matt. iii, 16): 'And Jesus when he was baptized went up straitway,' — that is, immediately — '*out of* the water.'

"It would be out of place here to go into a criticism of the Greek particles here rendered *into* and *out of*. They might with equal propriety be rendered *to* and *from*. They therefore teach us nothing as to the mode of baptism. They do not govern the meaning of the word *baptizo*, which is used in connection with them, in these passages, but are *themselves* governed by the meaning

which we attach to *baptizo*, independent of them. (See § 25). If, for instance, I believe, from other evidences, that Christ and the Eunuch were baptized by *immersion*, I should say that they went down *into* the water, and came up *out of it*. If I believe they were baptized by *sprinkling*, I should say *to* and *from*, instead of *into* and *out of*, unless I supposed that they stood in the water, which in those days of *sandals*, is perhaps quite probable. These particles, therefore, are of no use in settling the question, because their proper translation into English, depends on the sense of the words they are used in connection with.

"To show how the translation of these particles must vary according to the sense of the subject, take the following examples, where the word *eis*, here rendered *into*, is used. Acts xxvi, 14 : 'And when they were all fallen (*eis*) *to* the earth,' not *into* the earth John xi, 33 : 'Jesus therefore cometh (*eis*) *to* the tomb,' of Lazarus, not *into* the tomb. And John xx, 4, 5 : 'The other Disciple did outrun Peter, and came first (*eis*) *to* the sepulcher, and he, stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying ; yet went he not (*eis*) *in*.' Now if *eis* necessarily means *into*, we ought to read the passage thus : 'The other Disciple came first *into* the sepulcher,' etc., yet went he not *into* it, which would be absurd and contradictory. So in a multitude of other cases, the translations of these little words vary with the sense of the connection in which they are found. Carson, one of the most learned, and yet one of the most strenuous of the Baptists, says, in respect to Matt. iii, 16 : 'I admit that the proper translation of *apo*, is *from*, not *out of*, and that it would have its meaning fully verified, if they had only *gone down to the edge of* the water.' page 200. After all that has been said, therefore, as to the force of these words, *into* and *out of*, they prove nothing in respect to the mode of baptism, and we

are left just where we were, to learn historically what was the fact as to the *mode* of those baptisms.\*

"As to the baptism of Christ *in* or *at* the Jordan, it was performed by John, and we have said enough of John's baptism to show the strongest probability that it was administered by *sprinkling*. There is no reason to doubt that in its mode, it was with entire accordance with the Jewish mode of purifying. It may be added that the Jews, when they baptized themselves in a running stream, as they often did, were accustomed to kneel down in it, and with their hands threw the water back over their heads, and then *sprinkle* themselves. They do this still, as we are told by travelers. Here there is going down *into* the water, and coming up *out of* the water, without *immersion*. And to this day, Jewish pilgrims are often seen to go down to the Jordan, where Christ was baptized, and while they kneel down in or by the river, the administrator takes up a little water, and baptizes them, by applying it to their persons.† Thus they are baptized *with* water, and not *into* water. Christ was probably

\* It is a fact well known to all who have any knowledge of Greek, that the rule observed by the Greeks, in relation to prepositions connected with verbs of motion is this: When they wished *by the force of the words*, definitely to express the idea of *going into*, or *coming out of*, any place, as a house, a ship, the kingdom, etc., to prefix the preposition to the verb, and also to repeat it after the verb. As eiserchoemai eis, *I go into*, and ekporeuomai ek, *I go out of*; or embaino eis, *to go into*, and apobaino apo, *to go out of* or *from*. Speaking of Paul and Silas at Philippi, the writer says (Acts xvi, 40): "Exelthontes de ek tes phulankes, eis elthon eis ten Ludian." "And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia." Such a construction is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament history, when there was an actual entrance *into*, or an actual passing *out of* expressed; which would have been entirely pertinent, in respect to the water, had immersion been the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles. Still it is very remarkable, that in all the baptisms recorded, such a construction does not occur in a single instance.

† "Rabbah Taken," by E. W. Landis, p. 39.

baptized in this way, according to the Jewish usage, and went up ‘straightway’ *out of* or *from* the water. If he kneeled or stood in the river, he went *into* the water, and came *out of* it. If he kneeled by the side of the river, he went only to the water, and came *from* it. But the baptism of Christ, though performed by John, probably in the ordinary mode of his baptism, did not, as we have said, (§ 27,) partake of the nature and design of John’s baptism, as administered to others. It was a consecration to his priesthood ; the law (Exod. xxix, 4,) required the following purification to be performed in such cases : ‘And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring to the door of the tabernacle of the congregations, and shalt wash them with water.’ In Num. viii, 7, we are told how this washing is to be performed : ‘Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them ; *sprinkle* water of purifying upon them.’ Here then is another evidence, in addition to the general mode of John’s baptism, that Jesus was baptized by *sprinkling*.

“In the case of the Eunuch, the circumstances are equally and perhaps still more conclusive, in favor of sprinkling as the mode of his baptism. Philip was in Samaria, and the angel of the Lord directed him to ‘go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert.’ It was on the road, in the desert, that he met the Eunuch, who was a Jew of Ethiopia, and had been up to Jerusalem to worship. He was now returning, and having the Jewish scriptures with him, he was reading, as he sat in his chariot, in the prophecy of Isaiah. And the place where he read was this : ‘He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so he opened not his mouth.’ Now turn to Isa. liii, 7, and you will find the very passage which the Eunuch was reading. It is a part of the prophet’s description of the Saviour. But

the Eunuch understood it not. And so he said to Philip, ‘I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet thus ? of himself or of some other man ?’ And Philip began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus.’ He explained the prophecy, ‘and as they went on their way, they came to a certain water ; and the Eunuch said, see here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized ?’

“ Now what was it which led the Eunuch to think of being baptized just at this time ? It was the preaching of Philip, opening to him the scriptures which he had been reading. And it is remarkable that just in that connection, and only seven verses before, (Isa. lii, 15,) is the prophecy on which I have already remarked, as having been signally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost :\* ‘ *So shall he sprinkle many nations.*’ This, no doubt, Philip had explained to him. So far, therefore, as the mode is concerned, it was *sprinkling*, and not *immersion*, which was in the mind of the Eunuch, when he asked for baptism. And Jew, as he was, and accustomed to this mode of purification, what else could he have expected, or hoped, but to be baptized in this way ? And the place and the circumstances indicate that he was thus baptized.

“ The account says that they came to *some water*. The Greek word here translated *certain*, is *ti*, which does not indicate, as the English reader might imagine, a *well known* fountain of water. It means simply *some* or *any* water, and has sometimes the sense of a diminutive. So here it might be rendered, with strict propriety, ‘ they came to a little water,’ and the Eunuch exclaimed with evident emotion, when he saw it, ‘ Behold water ! ’ This is the literal translation of the original, *Behold water !* He does not say how much water. Nothing is said about a river. It was a desert, as we have seen, and the Eunuch was

\* Dr. Peters’s idea, alluded to here, is that some of all nations were really baptized on the day of Pentecost.

doubtless surprised and pleased, to come upon any water in such a place. Indeed it was in this vicinity, in the valley of Gerar, in which the city of Gaza stood, that Abraham and Isaac were obliged to dig wells to get water for their flocks; and ‘the herdsmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac’s herdsmen, saying, the water is ours.’ Gen. xxvi, 20. It was not far from this place that Philip baptized the Eunuch; and the water was probably one of those ‘springs in the desert,’ of which we read, (Gen. xxvi, 19). Such a spring, boiling out of the ground, was not likely to afford a convenient place of immersion, and all the probabilities are against the supposition that the Eunuch was thus baptized.

“The presumption, then, that there was a river in the desert, in which the Eunuch was immersed, is all a fancy. There is no intimation of any such thing. And the confidence placed in the English expressions *into* and *out of*, to prove that he must have been immersed, is without foundation. Besides, if these expressions prove anything, they prove too much for our opponents. For the account says, ‘They went down *both into* the water, *both Philip and the Eunuch*, and he baptized him,’ thus showing that their going into the water, was an action wholly distinct from the baptism. If they went *into* the water at all, they were *in* the water before the baptism was performed. Their going into the water, then, was no baptism. If it was, then Philip was baptized as much as the Eunuch. Thus all the circumstances of this baptism, which has been so much relied on, and so often quoted in confirmation of the views of Immersionists, are found to support the opposite doctrine, and render it highly probable, if not absolutely certain, that the Eunuch was baptized by *worinkliny.*” — Peters, pp. 89-98.

§ 31. OTHER Instances OF APOSTOLIC BAPTISM — THE APOSTLE PAUL, CORNELIUS, LYDIA, THE JAILER, AND TWO OTHERS. — SPRINKLING.

1. *The Baptism of the Apostle Paul.*

“The baptism of Saul (or Paul) also, which is the next that occurs in the sacred history, (Acts ix, 18, and xxii, 16,) sustains the same conclusion, as to the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles. The account says, that he was simply required to stand up, there where he was, and ‘he arose and was baptized.’ The ordinance, as it appears, was performed on the spot where he stood, probably by water drawn from some ‘water-pot of stone,’ which stood there in the house, when he had been three days fasting. There is no intimation, and no probability that he was plunged into water.”

2. *The Baptism of Cornelius and his Friends.*

“In the case of Cornelius and his neighbors in Cesarea, Acts x, 47, we are told that Peter preached at his house, and *many* were present to hear him. And it appears that they were all converted. ‘The Holy Ghost fell on them.’ Now to signify this falling of the Holy Ghost on them, our Baptist brethren say, they must have been *immersed into water*. But Peter intimates no such thing. He does not appear to see any water there; and so he says, ‘can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?’ In plain English phrase, ‘Will some one be kind enough to bring some water, that these may be baptized?’ Surely no Baptist minister would say, on such an occasion, ‘Can any man forbid water?’ etc. If immersion had been the mode, Peter would have said, as a Baptist would now say, ‘Can any man forbid us to go out to the river or pond,

that there may be *immersion?*' But Peter said what any Congregational, Presbyterian, or Methodist minister, in the same circumstances, might say, with the strictest propriety. The language here used, therefore, implies that the baptism was performed by the application of water to the person and not the person to the water."

### 3. *The Baptism of Lydia and her Household.*

"The case of Lydia and her household, Acts xvi 13-15, is also in point. The Apostles were not by the side of a river, near the city of Philippi, where they were accustomed to resort for prayer, when Lydia attended to the things which were spoken of Paul, and was *baptized*. She was away from her house, and probably had no change of raiment with her, and yet she 'was *baptized* and her household.' There was a river there it is true, in which they might have been immersed, if that had been the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles; but there was no other preparation for such a baptism. Surely the fact that they were 'by a river side,' does not prove that they baptized by immersion, especially when we are told that they went there, not for the convenience of baptizing, but because it was a place where prayer was wont to be made.' This and the other circumstances indicate that though Lydia and her household may have been baptized *with* the water of the river, the ordinance was probably performed in the usual way, by *sprinkling*."

### 4. *Baptism of the Jailer and his Family.*

The baptism of the Jailer and his Family, Acts xvi, 33, 34, is still more conclusive in illustration of the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles. All the circumstances detailed in this account, plainly show that immer-

sion was wholly out of the question. Paul and Silas were prisoners, whom the jailer had been solemnly charged to ‘keep safely ;’ and for this purpose, and in faithfulness to his charge, he had thrust ‘them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks.’ Suddenly, ‘at midnight there was an earthquake, which shook the foundation of the prison, threw open the doors and loosed the bands of the prisoners. The jailer awoke in the greatest consternation and alarm. He was overwhelmed with the thought that the occurrence would be his ruin. So strong were his feelings of obligation to *keep safely* those who had been committed to his charge, that when he saw the prison doors all open, and he supposed the prisoners were fled, ‘he drew out his sword and would have killed himself.’ It is not possible, therefore, to suppose, as some Baptists have imagined, that the jailer went out in the night, with the prisoners, to be baptized. It would have been a breach of his fidelity, an unjustifiable hazarding of the escape of the prisoners, which might have forfeited his life to the laws. And you see how sensitive he was on this point.

“Nor was this necessary. The jailer, it appears, by some means, had water at hand for the washing of their stripes. A little of the same water would serve for the purpose of his baptism. And more than all this, Paul himself virtually affirms that they did not go out during the night. As soon as the morning came, the magistrates sent to the jailer to ‘let those men go.’ But Paul said, ‘They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison ; and now do they thrust us out privately ? Nay, verily ; but let them come themselves and fetch us out.’ Surely, this refusal, so indicative of conscious integrity and uprightness, would have been made with a poor grace indeed, and without the least propriety, if the Apostles had already been out

during the night '*privately*' in search of a river or pond, in which to immerse the keeper of the prison and his family. We must, therefore, take the account just as it stands in the Bible, and believe that the jailer 'took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes,' there in the jail, where they were, 'and was baptized, he and all his straightway.'

"But it is said that he 'brought them out ;' that is, as I understand it, he brought them out of 'the inner prison,' into which he had thrust them for special safety. So, when he is said to have 'brought them out into his house,' it was only into another apartment of the same building, where he could more conveniently 'set meat before them.' This, however, was after he had 'washed their stripes, and was baptized, and all his.' All this was done in the prison proper, before he 'brought them into his house.' They then returned to the prison and remained there, under the charge of the keeper, until the next day, when, after Paul's refusal to go out, the magistrates 'came and besought them and brought them out.'

"The jailer 'and all his,' therefore, were baptized in the prison. And there is not the slightest proof that they were plunged into water there, but strong presumptive evidence that this would have been impracticable. There is no intimation of the presence of a bath suited to the performance of immersion ; and a jail, in those days of cruelty, was far less likely to be furnished, with such accommodation, than the dwellings of luxurious wealth. Indeed, there is no probability that these persons could have been *immersed* in the prison, at the dead hour of the night ; but every circumstance to indicate that water was brought in and applied to them by *sprinkling*."

##### 5. *Two other Instances of Baptism.*

"There are only two other instances of baptism per-

formed by the Apostles, as mentioned in the history of their acts. The first is that of the baptism of a number of Corinthians by Paul, Acts xviii, 7, 8. The second is that of Paul's baptizing certain disciples at Ephesus, who had been before baptized unto John's baptism, Acts xix, 1-5. But there are no circumstances, in these cases, which indicate the mode of administration.\* We are left, therefore, to infer that these baptisms were performed in the way so strongly indicated in all the other cases, as the only mode in which baptism was administered by the Apostles." *Peters, pp. 99, 106.*

### § 32. TESTIMONY OF HISTORY.—SPRINKLING.

The history of the ordinance sustains the same view of the subject. Tertullian, who lived in the fore part of the third century, is universally acknowledged to be the first writer of note, who speaks of immersion. And he informs us that the practice then was trine immersion, with all its forbidding appendages, such as the sign of the cross, oil, spittle, etc. (See sec. 4); showing conclusively that a mass of errors had crept into the church at that early age. Immersion seems to have been generally practiced from the second till the fifth century. From the early part of which baptism was again commonly administered in different parts of the church by sprinkling and pouring; which practice continued to gain

\* "Where were all these Disciples, when they were thus met, and instructed, and baptized by Paul? Were they certainly near to some pond or creek? If so, how singular it is, that converts, in those and other cases, could not be found, unless, by a remarkable coincidence, a large body of water was near! If all the ponds and creeks which exist in the imagination of Immersionists who interpret the Acts of the Apostle, had really watered Judea, then, it may be proved by calculation that there was water enough to have turned the whole land into a sea." *Kurtz on Baptism, p. 238,*

ground till the great Reformation restored the Bible and the light of truth to the common people; after being confined to the cells and cloisters of monks for a series of long years. And it is a remarkable fact, that since the Reformation, the doctrine of immersion has been losing ground, among the reading and thinking part of community, in the same proportion that the Bible is read and understood; and it doubtless will continue to lose ground till the truth of God shall finally triumph through the whole earth.\* Immersionists now form a very small moiety of the Christian Church, supposed to be only about one to fifty. It is also worthy of remark, that, with a few exceptions, all the most eminent expounders of the Word of God, are to be found in the ranks of those who practice baptism by sprinkling and pouring.

"Moreover, it is a fact worthy of particular notice, that during the dark period in which immersion was so rife, ling and pouring, was never called in question, such often the validity of the ordinance, as administered by sprinkling occurred on extraordinary occasions, such as the baptism of the sick called clinic baptism. These baptisms were pronounced valid by Cyprian, and sixty-six bishops assembled at the Council of Carthage, near the middle of the third century, ; and that noted passage in Ezekiel (xxxvi, 25,) was produced in support of it; 'then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean,' etc. Which clearly shows that sprinkling was baptism, in the estimation of Cyprian the learned bishop of Carthage. This same view of such baptisms was recognized

\* A statistical report of the Baptists in New York for 1853, says, "Mark this fact: During the last nine years, our numbers have decreased 'ten thousand and sixty-four.' But the population of the State has rapidly increased, and that of New York city has nearly doubled itself." The decrease is more than 1,000 per annum. A similar report from Cincinnati, says: "The Baptists in Cincinnati have in ten years increased their number only "one hundred and thirty-eight."

and sustained by the Council of Neocesarea, which was held some eighty years after the Council of Carthage.

"Eusebius mentions a disciple who had relapsed, but was reclaimed by the Apostle John and *re-baptized with his tears*. And there is mention of a Jew who was taken ill in the desert, and for want of water, was baptized by *sprinkling him with sand*; but afterwards recovered, and the baptism was pronounced valid by the bishop, with the addition only of pouring a little water upon him. In these instances, we see that sprinkling a man with tears and another with sand, were each viewed as a baptism. And Origen, a native Greek, who lived in the fore part of the third century, speaking of the altar on which Elijah directed the Priests to *pour* several barrels of water, says it was *baptized*. He it was, as we have seen, who substituted rantizo (to sprinkle,) for bapto (to dip,) Rev. xix, 13, in preparing a copy of the scriptures. Consequently, both pouring and sprinkling were considered baptism, by Origen, the greatest theologian of the age, as well as the most learned of all the fathers. These concessions of the Greek and Latin Christians, who generally practiced trine immersion, are too notorious to fear contradiction from the more intelligent; and they, with the greatest unanimity, pronounce baptism by sprinkling and pouring to be scriptural and valid. They said, 'Let not those who have received baptism by pouring be so far mistaken as to be baptized again.' *Peters.*

History too fully sustains us in saying the Waldenses, have always baptized by sprinkling and pouring. The Baptist brethren, it has been remarked, have manifested a fixed determination to claim those noble people as their ancestors, and holding their peculiar views of the ordinance of baptism; and if bold assertion, the testimony of the slanderous persecutors of the Waldenses, and some extraordinary liberties taken with history, could prevail,

the point must have been settled in their favor. It is a well known fact, that they now are Pedobaptists ; and it is not pretended that they practice immersion, under any circumstances. Rev. Dr. Baird, who spent some time among them, several years ago, says : "On the subject of baptism, these churches are, as has already been intimated, Pedobaptist. And their pastors assured us, that it is their belief, founded on their histories and traditions, that they have ever been such from the earliest times."

"And there is another important fact connected with this subject, that should not escape attention, which is this : We are unable to trace the origin of the Baptists, as a distinct denomination, holding their exclusive sentiments, any further back than the history of the Anabaptists, a set of fanatics which arose in Germany, after the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The Baptists are very fond of tracing their origin back through the Waldenses, and old Tertullian, and the Apostles, to John the Baptist. But it seems to me there are some long strides to make, and some dreadful chasms to fill, before they can possibly reach their honored namesake."

And there is still another remarkable fact, that claims attention before we close this sketch, which is this : When immersion came to be generally practiced, in the third and fourth centuries, the Fathers employed baptizo and baptisma, to represent the ordinance of baptism alone, but introduced other terms, the more definitely to express the act of immersion. The Greeks introduced kataduo and katadusis, to express an immersion *into* the water, and anaduo and anadusis to express an emersion *out of* the water. They speak thus of three immersions and emersions, (*treis katadusis kai anadusis*) of baptism. Which, by rendering baptisma immersion, would read thus : Three immersions and emersions of immersion, which would make nonsense. But then three acts of

immersion were necessary to make one baptism or purification ; and were in fact but one baptism. And in case they employed baptisma instead of kataduo, (which they seem to have done sometimes,) an explanatory note was deemed necessary, informing the reader that in that particular instance, baptisma means kataduo, lest some misunderstanding should arise. This fact proves most conclusively, that the Fathers did not understand baptizo as our Baptist brethren do, as meaning clearly and definitely to *immerse*. For if they had so understood it, it would not have been necessary to introduce other terms more expressive of the act of immersion, as both the Greeks and Latins did ; nor would the explanatory note have been deemed necessary to prevent obscurity and misunderstanding. So the history of the ordinance is entirely against immersion, and altogether favorable to sprinkling and pouring ; the validity of which was never called in question till quite recently, and then upon very slender authority, as the intelligent reader must see.

### § 33. RECAPITULATION.

Let us now close this part of the investigation by a brief recapitulation of the leading facts which we have been able to elicit, and which more directly prove that baptism administered by sprinkling and pouring is both scriptural and valid.

In the language of Dr. Peters (pp. 107, 108) : " We have now considered the divine warrant for baptism, the meaning of the term *baptizo*, and the Greek particles translated *into* and *out of*, in connection with it. We have illustrated the meaning of this word by the Jewish ordinances and usages, which the Apostles call *baptism* ; have showed that the very idea of cleansing or purifying by water, by blood, or by Spirit, is the application of the

purifying agent, or element to the person, and not the person to the element; have considered John's baptism *with* water, and those prophecies which are supposed to intimate, however obscurely, the mode of Christian baptism; and we have taken up and considered, in their order, all the instances of baptism described in the New Testament, as performed by the Apostles. And I trust, it is now plainly seen by the candid reader, that there is nothing to be found either in the meaning of the words used to designate baptism, or in the circumstances attending its administration, to favor the idea of *immersion*, as the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles. On the other hand, both the words and the circumstances respecting this subject, do greatly favor the mode of *sprinkling*; so much so indeed, as to constitute demonstrative proof that this is the only mode of baptism, as a religious ordinance, made known to us in the scriptures. It is the only mode prescribed."

But to be more pointed, we are able to arrive at the following conclusions, to wit:

1. Christian baptism is a significant ordinance, in which water is used as a symbol of spiritual cleansing or sanctification. Hence it is frequently called *a washing*, and *the washing of water*; as is abundantly evident from the foregoing investigations.

2. Baptizo, the *word* selected by the Holy Spirit to denote that ordinance, is a term of general import, and does not definitely specify the mode of application, neither does the commission given specify the mode; so that the requirement may be met, according to the letter, by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. But there are other circumstances which do clearly indicate the mode of application to be *sprinkling*, as the most convenient, the most appropriate, the most significant, as well as the

most scriptural mode of baptism; and of course, the most in accordance with the mind of the Spirit.

3. The mode which God did first select to represent spiritual cleansing, was sprinkling. The ablutions of the Levitical law, the mode of which was prescribed, were mostly required to be performed by sprinkling. No personal immersions were required. This fact has been sufficiently established. (§ 21.) "If then, sprinkling was once the most appropriate mode of representing spiritual purification, why is it not so still?" Moreover, the sacred writers never did represent spiritual cleansing by plunging a person under water, either literally or figuratively. Not one tittle of evidence to the contrary can be produced. "If, then, immersion was not then a suitable mode of representing sanctification, how can it be so now?"

4. "The inspired writers did constantly represent sanctification by sprinkling and peuring": "So shall he sprinkle many nations," "Tken will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean — A new heart also will I give you," etc. Here the prophets represent the same thing by sprinkling that we do in Christian baptism — *a new heart*. And the Apostles used the very same mode of expression, and to represent the very same thing — *the purification of the heart*. 'Having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' Then what mode of baptism so appropriate — so significant of spiritual cleansing,— and so much in accordance with the great system of truth, which runs through every dispensation of the Church — through all time?"

5. The work of the Holy Spirit — of which the water is the emblem — is called *baptism*, and *the washing of regeneration*. "For by one Spirit are we all *baptized* into one body — and have been made all to drink into one Spirit." But here let us inquire what mode God has

selected by which to represent this baptism of the Holy Ghost. And we shall find that the Spirit is uniformly represented as *poured out, shed forth, falling upon, etc.* “I will *pour out* in those days of my Spirit ;” “He hath *shed forth* this which ye now see and hear,” and John said, “I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall *baptize* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” This prediction was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost ; there was indeed a baptism of the Holy Spirit, but there was no immersion in the Spirit. And the law of analogy requires that there should be a strict resemblance or similarity between the symbol and the thing represented ; and I ask what possible analogy does exist between immersion under water, and the pouring out, shedding forth, falling upon, etc., of the Holy Spirit ?

6. “From the time Christian baptism was instituted, we find not one instance on record of the Apostles going after water for the purpose of baptizing. Philip and the Eunuch were not going in search of water, but came to it on their journey. The Apostle Paul, according to the obvious meaning of the language, was baptized in a city, in a private house, standing up, as we have seen. Ananias came and found him blind and enfeebled, and said unto him, ‘Arise,’ (stand up) ‘and be baptized ;’ ‘and he arose and was baptized.’ Tens of thousands were baptized by the Apostles, in a country having few streams of water of any considerable depth, yet they were always able to be baptized, the many or the few, without delay, whenever, and wherever they professed faith — in the crowded city, in the country, in the desert, in the prison, night or day. And in no one instance is it recorded, that they went one step out of their way after water ! This is indeed most unaccountable, if immersion was then practiced ; but if the Apostles baptized as we do, the history of their baptisms is just such as we should

have expected. Just so Pedobaptists, who practice pouring and sprinkling, write ; and thus our immersionist friends do not write. We certainly write as Luke wrote, whether we practice as he did or not."

7. Although immersion became so prevalent for a time in the Church, and the Fathers generally practiced trine immersion, yet they did not predicate their practice upon the import of the word baptizo, as specifying that particular mode of baptism ; but upon the fact that it is an open term, admitting of the greatest latitude, as to the mode of application. This is quite obvious from the following facts : 1st, the definition of the term as given by the Fathers. 2nd, their application of baptizo, with the sense of *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*, thus making it a perfect synonym of katharizo, to purify. And 3d, their recognition of pouring and sprinkling as valid baptism, when performed in cases of emergency. This fact, we repeat, clearly shows, that the Fathers never viewed the meaning of the term as imperiously demanding the practice of immersion, but only as admitting it ; and, as they thought, more appropriate, because it was considered a more thorough and complete washing.

The argument for the mode of baptism is now brought to a close. I intend, however, to add something more upon the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or the work of the Spirit, in regeneration, sanctification, and the bestowment of miraculous gifts, which cannot directly affect the mode of baptism, either the one way or the other.

## PART II.

---

### SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

WE have now reached, in the course of this investigation, that point which introduces to our consideration, the baptism of the Holy Spirit; and the exposition of several scripture passages which refer to the subject of spiritual baptism. This is necessary to render the work complete, as it corresponds, in the main, with what is termed in the most of the works of the day, “*the design of baptism.*” And it has at least an indirect bearing upon the general argument in ascertaining the scripture mode of baptism, by the very natural process of judging of the cause from the effects produced—the analogy that exists between the type and the antitype. In the language of scripture the term baptism is applied to almost the whole of the Spirit’s work, both in his ordinary and his extraordinary influences; not only in enlightening and sanctifying believers, but also in enduing them with miraculous gifts.

Furthermore, that part of the subject which remains to be discussed, is of far more importance in almost every point of view, than that which has gone before, since the one is merely the shadow or emblem, while the other is the substance—the reality. But it must necessarily be

accomplished at the expense of some repetitions, as nearly all the texts upon the subject of baptism, have already passed under review, and most of the remarks and criticisms which are necessary in the one case, will also apply in the other, from the very close correspondence which necessarily exists between the two. And since spiritual baptism is of paramount importance, and since there has been comparatively little written or published upon this part of the subject, it hence becomes necessary to give it a general, though it may be but a brief examination. In doing which, I propose to notice it in the following particulars, to-wit: (1.) The reality; (2.) Perpetuity; (3.) Author; (4.) Means employed; (5.) The nature; and (6.) The effects of spiritual baptism.

#### § 34. THE REALITY OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

John the Baptist says, (Matt. iii, 11): “I indeed baptize you with water—*he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*” Here “John draws the contrast between his own baptism and that of Christ, which exists in three particulars—the subject, the agent, and the means. In the case of John the subject was the body, the agent was a man, and the means was the water. In the case of Christ, the subject was the mind, the agent was the Holy Spirit, and the means were the truth and emotions of God.” This prediction of John was fully verified on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, both in the Spirit’s purifying and miraculous influences.

“When the Pentecost was fully come,” says Dr. Jenkyn, “the influences of the Holy Spirit manifested themselves under a two-fold aspect: the miraculous and the ordinary, or the immediate and the mediate. On the Apostles the influences were partly ordinary and partly

miraculous. On the three thousand converts the influences were ordinary alone. This is evident from the different results of the respective classes of influences. The effects of the immediate influences on the Apostles were, that they spake with other tongues, and wrought various miracles. The effects of the ordinary influences on the converts were, that ‘they continued daily in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And they continued steadfast in the Apostle’s doctrine and fellowship.’”

And Paul says, 1 Cor. xii, 13, “*For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body*—and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” Here the Holy Spirit is directly said to baptize, and in this case all external acts are of course excluded, and purify is the only appropriate sense. If any shall say, that admitting to the church by the external rite, or that extraordinary gifts, is here meant, I reply, admission into the visible Church is never performed by the Spirit, but by man. And this baptism is as much an internal work of the Holy Spirit, as the causing to drink into one Spirit, which is not external, but an internal and real work of the Spirit.\* Nor could extraordinary gifts be here meant, for the text says “we all,—including the Apostles and all other believers—have been made to share in this baptism into one body, and to drink into one Spirit; which will not apply to extraordinary gifts, for they were not conferred upon all indiscriminately. Besides, both this text and the parallel one, (Gal. iii, 27, 28,) expressly point out the legitimate effects of this internal work of the Spirit, here called baptism, in removing all the ordinary distinctions known among men. Effects which cannot, with any degree of propriety, be affirmed, either of the external

\* See Beecher, pp. 26, 28.

rite, or of extraordinary gifts. "For," says the Apostle, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." These effects, the removal of all these natural distinctions clearly involve the idea of an internal spiritual work, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh — the old man with his deeds; and that of *putting on Christ*, or "the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." Compare Rom. xiii, 14, and Col. iii, 9-11.

Pres. Beecher says upon this subject, (p. 111,) "What then are the facts as they present themselves in the New Testament? They are these:

1. There is a baptism infinitely more important than the external baptism, and of which the external baptism is but a sign.

2. In the spiritual baptism, a believer is actually purged from sin and guilt, by the Holy Ghost. In the external, the forgiveness of sins is openly announced to him, on the assumption that he has repented and believes, as he professes.

3. The person baptized (with water) is regarded as calling on the name of the Lord for forgiveness, and the baptizer as announcing his forgiveness in the name of the Lord. Acts xxii, 16.

4. In the case of internal baptism, there is no such external use of the name of God, but a real forgiveness resulting in actual union to Christ. Hence,

5. The form — Baptizesthai eis onoma Christon — to be baptized in the name of Christ, is adapted to express the external baptism; Baptizesthai eis Christon — to be baptized into Christ — to express the internal baptism, that actually unites to Christ.

6. To this view, all facts accord, for in every instance where onoma (name) is used, there is internal evidence in the passage to prove that external baptism is meant; Matt. xxviii, 19; Acts ii, 38; Acts viii, 16; Acts x, 48; Acts xix, 5; Acts xxii, 16; 1 Cor. i, 13, 15.

But in every case where onoma (name) is omitted, and eis (into) precedes Christon, (Christ,) or soma (body,) denoting the spiritual body of Christ, (the church invisible,) there is internal evidence that external baptism is not meant, and that internal is meant. Rom. vi, 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii, 13; Gal. iii, 27."

There are several passages in the Old Testament scripture, which, when properly understood, are evidently prophecies of spiritual baptism; particularly Isa. iv, 4; Mal. iii, 1-3, and Eze. xxxvi, 25.

That these passages are predictions of the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the days of the Messiah, the testimony of the Fathers is very abundant. And though their theological views are not to be depended upon in every instance, still, in this particular, they are of some value, in ascertaining what the sense of the church was upon this subject, at that early period, even down to the age when miracles had scarcely ceased. Says Beecher, (p. 217,) "The Fathers saw types of this baptism in the fire that came down from Heaven and consumed the sacrifice of Elijah, and the fire kindled by Nehemiah, according to the 2d Book of Maccabees, by sprinkling water.

"Thus, said they, in the baptism of fire, a divine and heavenly fire descends from above, and enters into the heart, and purges out the dross of sin, and makes us pure.

"Nor is this view sustained by the Fathers alone. It originates from the very nature of things. The Holy Spirit is neither figuratively nor literally, a river, lake, or pool, but a living, intelligent being, from whom an illu-

minating and purifying influence goes forth, as light and heat from the sun.

"Hence we are not spoken of as immersed in Him, but purified by Him ; hence, too, it is proper to speak of His influences as poured out, or descending as the rain, or going forth as the light or fire."

"A few illustrations of these from Cyril of Alexandria must suffice. He refers, Mal. iii, 1-3, to the baptism of Christ, and thus proceeds : 'This divine fire from Heaven, that is, gracious influence through the Holy Spirit, when He enters into the heart, then, then indeed, He cleanses away the pollutions of our former transgressions and makes us pure.' This divine and spiritual fire, the inspired John clearly announced, saying, 'I indeed purify (baptize) you with water, but He shall purify you with the Holy Spirit and fire.' Here the fiery influence is conceived as coming from the Holy Spirit, and entering and purifying the heart. Moreover, Cyril here agrees with Origen, Basil and others, in considering the language of John as referring to and taken from those passages in the Old Testament which predict of the Messiah, purification, and that alone. And Cyril oft repeats the same ideas in other parts of his works. But his comment on Isa. iv, 4, is still more striking. He first refers the passage, as Basil does, to the baptism of Christ, and then explains the spirit of burning thus : 'We call it grace which comes into us at the holy baptism, not without the agency of the Holy Spirit. For we are not baptized with mere water, \* \* \* but by the Holy Spirit, and by divine and spiritual fire, which consumes all the pollution of wickedness in us, and melts out the pollution of sin. Such a coming of our Saviour also, another of the holy prophets foretold, saying, 'Behold He shall come as a refiner's fire, and as fuller's soap, and He shall sit and purify as gold and silver.' \* \* \* I remark that through the

whole passage he refers to a divine influence proceeding from God, which he calls spiritual fire, which enters the heart, and consumes and melts out the pollution of sin. He also, in this passage, unites both, Isa. iv, 4, and Mal. iii, 1-3, as predictions of baptism by the Holy Ghost and by fire, to be introduced by Christ.

"By means of such testimony, the controversy as to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, is settled most unanswerably and forever." *Beecher, pp. 217, 218.*

### § 35. THE PERPETUITY OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

That the personal presence of the Holy Spirit, in His diversified operations, of the ordinary character, including spiritual baptism of course, is a permanent blessing inherited by the church, is an established fact, by a number of scripture considerations.

Says Dr. Jenkyn,\* "The supernatural influences which accompanied the Pentecostal phenomenon were, speaking philosophically, the accidents suited and necessary for that occasion only, rather than the essential elements of the *promise* and *design* of Jesus Christ. The grounds, therefore, on which the Christian Church is warranted to expect saving influences to continue in permanent operation, remain undisturbed and impregnable. On these grounds I take up the position, that the converting and saving influences, which the Holy Spirit manifested on the day of Pentecost, are always to continue in the church, and ought always to be as much expected and waited for as they were by the first Disciples.

"The influences of the Holy Spirit are essentially necessary to the continuance of the church in the world.

\* The most of this section is abridged from Dr. Jenkyn's Work on the Spirit.

Constant and continued accessions of new converts are essential to its very existence, as well as its continual holiness and consolation. Which are all essentially and absolutely the work of the Holy Spirit.

"Jesus Christ is maintaining a constant intercession with the Father, that the influences of the Holy Spirit might be permanent in the church. He said, 'I will pray the Father for you, and He shall send you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever.' This intercession is not yet closed, and as long as 'the blood that speaketh' pleads for us, the church has warrants, by which it is impossible for God to lie, to expect that the influences of the Comforter will abide in it, fresh, strong, and lively forever. Our Lord gave to His Church a pledge which He has never recalled : 'I will not leave you comfortless,' or 'orphans :' but never were orphans more destitute, and forlorn, than would the church be without the Holy Spirit. But this constitutes the prime object of the Spirit's personal mission into the world, as has been remarked, to supply the personal absence of the Lord. It is true, He was going away for a season ; but He would not leave them comfortless—He would come again by His Spirit, and finally the second time without sin unto salvation. It was in this sense that He said, 'Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world ;' and again, 'When two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' He is eminently present by His Spirit.

"The Christian dispensation is pre-eminently designated 'the ministration of the Spirit ;' not only to distinguish it from the dispensation of the law, but because His personality, divinity, and agency, are so transcendently manifested in gospel times as to outshine all former manifestations, and indeed to render them as if they had not been by reason 'of the glory that excelleth.' The Holy

Spirit formed the character of the author and subject of the gospel ; endows with various gifts and talents, the ministers of the gospel ; appoints to ministers their respective spheres of labor ; and gives to every agent and laborer for souls a determinate measure and kind of success. All the ordinances of the sanctuary, and all the means of grace, and all the duties and privileges of the Church of Christ, have a direct and constant reference to the Holy Spirit.

“ The influences of the day of Pentecost continue to this day, undiminished and unchangable, in the perpetual inspiration and power of the New Testament. Other means of inspiration have ceased ; the Shekinah is forever quenched ; the Urim and Thummim have withdrawn their splendors ; the Bath Kol has hushed ; angelic visits are discontinued ; dreams and visions are annulled ; but the scriptures, ‘ the Word of the Lord abideth forever.’ The events of the Pentecost prove that the New Testament is the revelation of the Spirit, and the abiding medium of His inspiration. The author of the Acts of the Apostles always describes the preaching of the gospel by a word parakagein, derived from the office of the Holy Paroclete ; and the transmission of the gospel to succeeding ages, and to other nations, is always a conveyance (ministration) of the influences of the Holy Spirit.

“ It is distinctly promised, that the Holy Spirit shall continue to be through all time present in the church. ‘ As for me, this is my covenant with them saith the Lord ; my Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and forever.’ In this ‘ exceeding great and precious promise,’ God marshals around Him all the hosts of His people,

calls their fixed attention to what He is promising, what He engages to do, and what may be expected from His pledged character. His promise is universal in its aspect, and uninterrupted in its continuance. In harmony with this early assurance, one of the last of the prophets is commissioned to say, ‘My Spirit remaineth among you, fear not.’ And the blessed Saviour said, just before His departure, ‘I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever.’ John xvi, 16. This promise is not limited to the Apostles, but is extended to all that believe, and to all the churches that shall ever be collected by the ministry of the gospel. Said Christ, ‘Lo ! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’

“The administration of Christian baptism in the name of a trinity of persons in the Godhead, is predicated in the fact, that the Holy Spirit has a permanent residence in the church with all His plenitude of blessings, as well as the Father and the Son. Also, the gospel benediction assumes that the communion of the Spirit shall be in the church as permanent as the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God our Father. God has furnished the church with a regular system of means, which he has designedly contrived and adjusted to put His people in direct communication with the supply of the Spirit. The conventional name given to these ordinances is most felicitous : they are called ‘the means of grace.’ These means are always the channel and the conduits for the communications and conveyance of the holy influences.

“The distinct and separate class of duties, which the church owes to the Holy Spirit personally, springs from the doctrine that His influences are permanently present. ‘If the influences of the Spirit are not now really present in the church, our duties toward Him are become as nuga-

tory, as those of the present race of Jews towards the angel that once led the church in the wilderness. Take a few specimens of our duties. ‘Be ye filled with the Spirit ;’ ‘Walk in the Spirit ;’ ‘Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God ;’ ‘Quench not the Spirit.’

“ The obligations of these duties are binding only, as they are linked to the immovable truth, that the hallowed fire of Divine influences is in the Church permanently present. These duties and admonitions did not relate to the early Christians alone ; they are also ‘things which belong to our peace.’ We have not the shadow of any intimation that their obligations have been either revoked or rescinded. The self-same Spirit who imposed those duties at first, enforces them to-day ; and he urges them only on the ground, that ‘he abides with us forever.’ Hence, from all these considerations — with a number of others which might be adduced — the fact that the personal presence of the Holy Spirit, is the permanent inheritance of the Church, from the day of his descent at the Pentecost — through all future time — in all the plenitude of his sanctifying and saving influences, — including of course the *baptism of the Holy Spirit* — is clearly and fully established. For to deprive the Church of the baptism of the Spirit, is to divest her wholly of a Divine influence of the very first importance. It would be, in fact, to deprive her altogether of the office-work of the Holy Comforter.

### § 36. THE AUTHOR OR AGENT EMPLOYED IN SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

As we have already seen, there are a number of Old Testament prophecies in which it is clearly predicted, that the Messiah should purify or baptize. And, as President Beecher remarks, (p. 25) : “ This view alone fully explains

the existing expectation — prevalent among the Jews, that the Messiah would baptize (John i, 25). But especially is this foretold in that last and prominent prophecy of Malachi (iii, 1-3) which was designed to fill the eye and the mind of the nation until he came.

“He is here presented to the mind in all his majesty and power, but amid all other ideas, that of purifying is most prominent. He was above all things to purify and purge, and that with power so great, that few could endure the fiery day. ‘Who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth?’” — (See § 14).

And, as we have already seen, (§ 34,) the New Testament is equally clear and explicit upon the subject. In that oft repeated text, (Matt. iii, 11,) it was clearly predicted by John, that the Messiah should baptize. Says he : “I indeed baptize you with water — he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” And in 1 Cor. xii, 13, the Apostle ascribes this baptism directly to the agency of the Holy Spirit himself. He says : “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.”

The testimony of the Fathers upon this subject is also full and explicit. I will here introduce some brief quotations, as usual, upon the authority of Pres. Beecher, pp. 215, 216.

The facts are these. The Fathers, in commenting on those passages in the Old Testament, in which it is predicted that the Messiah should purify, do regard them as predictions that He should baptize, and state explicitly that the words *baptizo* and *katharizo* (to purify) mean the same thing. Of this Basil’s comment on Isa. iv, 4, (§ 17) is an unanswerable proof. In the Old Testament, it is said, concerning the Messiah, *ekplunei* and *ekkathariei* — He shall wash, and He shall purge or purify.

“In the New, John says, *Baptisei* — He shall baptize,

and Basil says, they mean the same thing ; and then defines baptism — baptism — as meaning katharismos — purification.

“ Nor is this all. Eusebius, of Cesarea, sustains the same view. Commenting on this passage, he says that the preposition *en* (here rendered by) is used in the causative sense, when applied to the Holy Spirit, not only in this passage, but in the New Testament too ; for he says that the expression *by* the spirit of judgment, and *by* the spirit of burning, (*Isa. iv, 4,*) are equivalent to the expression, *by* the Holy Spirit and fire, in the New Testament. \* \* \* The whole comment is this : “ Observe whether this passage is not, to a remarkable degree, coincident in sense with the evangelical testimony concerning our Saviour. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire ; ” for the expression “ by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning ” does not at all differ in sense from the expression “ by the Holy Ghost and fire.” In the one case, (*Isa. iv, 4,*) fiery words reproving them, produced a purification (katharsin) of sins, and in like manner, of our Saviour in the gospel, it is said, “ He shall purify, (*baptisei*) not with water, but by the Holy Spirit and fire.”

In regarding *Isa. iv, 4*, as a prophecy of baptism, Origen, Eusebius, Basil, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, all coincide, and just as clearly do Theodoret and Cyril regard *Mal. iii, 3*, to which I referred, as a prophecy of baptism ; and the same is true of other passages in the Old Testament, in which it is foretold that the Messiah should purify.”

Inasmuch, then, as it was foretold that the Messiah should purify, and inasmuch as purify and baptize are, by the testimony of the Fathers, synonymous, it was of course foretold that the Messiah should baptize. And a prediction that He should baptize, would of course awaken

an expectation that He would baptize. Hence the expectation is accounted for, as stated before.

Furthermore. "Not only is the causative sense of en thus established by the comment of Eusebius of Cesarea, and other Fathers, on Isa. iv, 4; but it is no less clearly established by 1 Cor. xii, 13, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." In all the context of this passage, the Spirit is represented as an active, intelligent Divine person, by whom wisdom, faith, and spiritual gifts are bestowed; and en and dia are interchanged as equivalent. To one is given by (dia) the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another, the gifts of healing, by (en) the same Spirit. All these things worketh that one and the self same Spirit dividing to every one as He will. After this comes the assertion, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body;" that is, of necessity, purified and then united in one spiritual body, not immersed into one body. The Spirit never immerses externally—besides, immersion into a body is absurd." Beecher, p. 313.

From the foregoing, the scriptures clearly refer the baptism of the Holy Spirit to Christ as the Author of that work, and also as clearly refer this work to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, as an intelligent, voluntary Divine Agent. Hence, while one prominent text says, in reference to Christ, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," another, with equal clearness, affirms that it is "By one Spirit we all are baptized into one body;" making the Holy Ghost the immediate agent in this internal baptism. And there is no real contradiction in the word of God.

In the great scheme of salvation, all the persons of the blessed Trinity—constituting the one God—are essentially engaged; but it has pleased the Father that Christ should have the pre-eminence in all things pertaining to

the Church. Hence he says, " My Father worketh hitherto and I work." And again : " As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will ; " and " It is the Spirit that quickeneth." But all things of a spiritual nature, are under the direction of Christ, as the Head of the Chnrch — the spiritual body. He has suffered and atoned for us, and hence, he is the procurer of every spiritual good ; and it is to him we address our prayers at the door of mercy. Hence there is a propriety that he should be the dispenser of all these blessings. And although the Spirit is the prime agent in the work of conversion, still Christ concurs in it in every instance ; and we are baptized in his name, and it is in his name that our forgiveness is announced. Hence the propriety too of his being represented in the Gospel as the Author of spiritual baptism ; especially, at the beginning of the Christian dispensation. For a very prominent object of this baptism, in its extraordinary influences, was the stupendous miracles wrought in attestation of Christ's mission and authority to change the dispensation. And its objects accomplished, this extraordinary baptism ceased with the age of miracles.

But inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is a voluntary agent, and since the gospel is the ministration of the Spirit ; and inasmuch as the prominent object of his presence in the Church is to supply the personal absence of Christ, and especially, since he is the principal agent in conversion — which is in fact the baptism of the Holy Spirit ;—there is, therefore, the greatest propriety in his exercising this prerogative through all future time. Consequently, for this purpose, the Spirit is promised and sent by the Father ; and he proceeds from the Father and the Son — and he is emphatically styled "*The Promise* of the Father."

I, therefore, arrive at this conclusion upon the subject : That both Christ and the Spirit exercise an agency in the

administration of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that there is a propriety in assigning this work of the Spirit, in his extraordinary gifts and miraculous powers, to Christ as the immediate agent. And since this baptism is contained in the Church, in its ordinary effects, in purifying the heart of the believer, by the washing of regeneration, and uniting the soul to Christ, by translating it from the power of darkness to the kingdom of God's dear Son; there appears to be the greatest propriety in assigning this work more immediately to the province of the Holy Spirit. And it is in accordance with this view, we shall endeavor to prosecute the subject in this investigation.

### § 37. THE MEANS EMPLOYED IN SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

In noticing the *means* employed in the baptism of the Spirit, we shall not attempt an enumeration of all the means and instrumentalities which are employed in the work of conversion, but only such as strictly belong to spiritual baptism. And these are three—the truth of God, the blood of Christ, and the direct agency of the Holy Spirit.

#### 1. *The Truth or Word of God.*

That the Word of God exerts a salutary influence in spiritual baptism, is abundantly evident from a number of scripture passages. Believers are said to be *begotten* with the word of truth, to be *born* by the word, to be *made free* by the truth, and to be *cleansed* and *sanctified* through the truth. And Paul commended the Ephesian elders to God, and the word of his grace, and added, “It is *able* to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them who are *sanctified*.” Consequently, the *truth* or *word* of God holds a prominent place among the

means employed in dispensing the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Again : the Apostle speaking of Christ's purifying the Church, (Eph. v, 26,) says : "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water *by the word*." This passage brings to view a purification symbolized by the washing of water, but it is expressly said to be effected *by the word*, as the instrument. And God has in other instances used water as the symbol of truth. "Then will I *sprinkle clean water* upon you, and ye shall be *clean* : from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." It is evident that this celebrated prophecy of Ezekiel alludes primarily to a great purification to be effected by the truth, under the similitude of water, and not to a literal sprinkling of water in the ordinance of baptism. Still the mode of application — that of sprinkling — is in strict accordance with the Levitical purifications. There is some incongruity of ideas in sprinkling the body with water, to cleanse from idolatry, while there is none in sprinkling the mind by the word or with the truth, to dissipate ignorance or dispel idolatry. A sprinkling of knowledge or of science is a common phrase. Hence the propriety of the expressions, the "*washing* of regeneration," and "*renewing* of the Holy Ghost." To denote the beginning and progress of the divine life by the Spirit, under the symbol of washing. May not this view afford a clue to that more difficult text in Isaiah : "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." So shall he astonish — or sprinkle — the many nations — during the millennium, by the dissemination of gospel truth.

In all the instances of conversion recorded in the New Testament, the truth holds a prominent place. The Ethiopian Treasurer read the word of God, and it was explained to him by Philip. Lydia heard the word, and attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul.

And so of all the other recorded instances. And the same fact is corroborated by the whole history of revivals of religion in every age and country, and also, by our own experience in the present day. We witness no conversions away from the knowledge of the truth. We hear of no revivals springing up in destitute settlements, where the gospel is not preached. “How shall they believe in him of whom they have not *heard*.” See more in § 26, 4.

## 2. *The Blood of Christ.*

The blood of Jesus Christ is also a *means* of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is the meritorious or efficacious cause of the sinner’s return to God, for it lies at the very foundation of his justification and sanctification in a governmental point of view. We are represented as purchased or redeemed with his blood, as washed from our sins in his own blood, and as sanctified or cleansed by his blood. And it is a solemn truth, that all that is valuable to the sinner, both in a legal and a moral point of view, is to be ascribed to the efficacy of Christ’s blood.

The blood of Christ derives its value from the fact that he has become our *sacrifice* for sin,—a substitute to the law and justice of God—a sin-offering for us; and by his stripes—or sufferings—we are healed. The atonement, as has been remarked, was prefigured and illustrated by the Levitical purifications; and its abiding efficacy was typically set forth by “the waters of separation,” (Num. xix,) which constituted a perpetual fountain of cleansing, for the ceremonially unclean. And as we have seen before, the baptism of the Spirit is two-fold—deliverance from sin, and purification from spiritual defilement, correspondent with the double object of atonement (See §§ 13 and 22.)

The blood of Christ is rendered available by its being

applied — or sprinkled — to the polluted conscience. In the case of the paschal lamb, it was not only necessary that the lamb should be slain, and its blood shed, but to render that blood available, it was indispensable that it should also be *sprinkled*; and it was this sprinkled blood that preserved the first-born of Israel when the destroying angel passed through the land. Christ has become our Passover — “the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.” But his blood must not only be shed, but also applied or sprinkled, in every instance, to render it available for lost sinners. Hence it is significantly called “*the blood of sprinkling*.” It is deposited in heaven, — A FOUNTAIN OPENED — like that which the prophet saw — for the *washing away* of sin and uncleanness. It is also called “*the precious blood of Christ*,” and “*the blood of God*,” in reference to its intrinsic value. But as we have already seen, this inestimable ingredient, in a legal, as well as a moral point of view, must be applied to us individually, by the agency of the Spirit, to become available; which will constitute the concluding division of this section.

### 3. *The Agency of the Holy Spirit.*

The direct agency of the Spirit is of course indispensable as a *means* in the administration of spiritual baptism. The subject of Divine Agency in general is too extensive to receive even a brief notice here, nor does it strictly fall within the compass of this work. Still it becomes necessary to guard the unwary reader against some mistakes to which he is liable, from the language employed in some passages of scripture, which will necessarily come up in the course of this investigation.

It is the province of the Spirit to quicken or impart a new life; and conversion is frequently called a new creation, in allusion to the old or first creation, in which the

agency of the Spirit is very prominent. In the first creation, "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters ;" and by his Spirit he garnished the heavens. But the first intimation which appears in the scriptures of a spiritual resurrection, is found in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel — the vision of the valley of dry bones — the idea frequently occurs in the New Testament, and in immediate connection too with the subject of spiritual baptism. The Apostle (Eph. i, 18–20, and ii, 1–6) institutes a comparison between the resurrection of Christ and that of the soul dead in trespasses and in sins ; and also of the power of God which is exerted in both instances ; making it no less an act of omnipotent power in the one case than in the other. He wishes the Ephesians to "know the *exceeding greatness* of God's power towards us who believe, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead." And (Rom. vi, 4,) he says : "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father," (or by the power of God,) "even so we also shou'd walk in newness of life." And again, (Col. ii, 12,) he says : "Ye also are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God," (or faith in the power of God,) "who hath raised him from the dead."

From this strong language of the Apostle, and the phrases, "a new heart," "a right spirit," "a new creature," etc., some have been brought to view conversion as entirely a physical change, and of course, to ascribe it wholly to the omnipotent power and agency of God. While others to avoid this extreme, have fallen into the opposite one, equally dangerous, and have affirmed that conversion is entirely a moral change, and consequently to refer it altogether to man's own agency. Now the truth, as is generally the case, appears to lie between these two extremes, and to be partly physical and partly moral

or spiritual ; since there are some scriptures which refer it to the agency of God, and others to the agency of man. Therefore, in the work of regeneration or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the direct personal agency of the Spirit and a concurring agency of the creature are both contemplated. In the first creation the Lord spake, "and it was done." He said : "Let there be light, and there was light." So it is in the phenomenon of conversion. It is "not by *might*, nor by *power*, but by the Spirit of God."

It is strictly the province of the Spirit to apply the truth to the sinner's conscience, and to render it effectual by the virtual application of the blood of Christ. One part of his mission into the world is to teach us all things, and to bring all things to remembrance that Christ had said during the days of his flesh. Or in other words, to keep the truth of God ever before our minds. When Lydia heard Paul preach, the Lord *opened* her heart, that she *attended* unto the things which were spoken ; and they were *made* effectual in her conversion.

So it is in every instance. The sinner hears the truth, and is then brought to a discovery of his true condition in the moral government of God, and being not disobedient to the heavenly vision, he appears a penitent at the door of mercy, and is enabled to take hold of Christ by faith in his blood ; the Spirit, who has led him thus far, now applies that blood in the remission of sins ; or in other language, sprinkles the sinner's heart from an evil conscience by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. And he can say in the language of triumph, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined into my heart, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. And I, with open face, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, and changed into the same image, from glory to glory,

even as by the Spirit of the Lord.” But the “*excellency of the power*” is of God, and not of me.

### § 38. THE NATURE OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

In giving a description of the baptism of the Spirit, it is necessary to observe, as we have already seen, that it is of two kinds; extraordinary, and ordinary or direct. And we need only to advert to the circumstances as they occurred on the day of Pentecost, when it was first vouch-safed, for an illustration, from the different effects. (See § 34.)

Again, the baptism of the Spirit may be divided into external and sensible, and internal and spiritual, with regard to effects. As witnessed at the Pentecost, by the assembled multitude in his extraordinary character, the effects were external and sensible, they were convinced of the truth of the gospel — were cut to the heart, and cried, Men and brethren, what shall we do? But as many as believed in the name of the Lord, received the remission of sins and internal purification. And inasmuch as the external or extraordinary class of influences has long since ceased — the objects being accomplished — and the internal alone, is the permanent blessing of the Church; it will of course be unnecessary to take any further notice of that kind of operations which was peculiar to the primitive ages of Christianity.

We now come directly to the examination of spiritual baptism, as it is enjoyed by the Church. The reader has no doubt ere this anticipated our description, at least in part, as it has incidentally appeared in the course of this investigation. We have in general terms made it to correspond with conversion or regeneration. It is in fact, regeneration itself, exclusive of the different states of mind which precede that change. It includes the ideas of

the forgiveness or remission of sins, the purification of the heart or the moral powers of the soul, and union with Christ, or a translation from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's dear Son. Or in other words, it is a death to sin, and a regeneration to a new life ; and also a progressive sanctification — the mortification of the flesh by a continual death, and a continual resurrection to a life of holiness. But since the adherents of the opposite view deny these positions, and others aver that the Church does not now enjoy the blessings of spiritual baptism in any shape, it hence becomes indispensable that we should present some arguments in support of this view.

Pres. Beecher says (pp. 310, 311) : " Clearly the whole discussion on this point, turns on the question, Is the Holy Spirit spoken of as a person who purifies or as an influence in which Christians are immersed ? and this depends on the rendering of the preposition *en*. If we render it *by*, then a person may be denoted ; thus, ' He shall baptize you by the Holy Ghost.' This demands purify as the sense of baptism, for the Holy Ghost as a person does not immerse, he purifies. On the other hand, if we render *en* by *in*, then divine influence is implied, and the sense immerse is admissible, though even then it is not necessary. He shall immerse you in Divine influences may be the sense. Dr. Carson insists that that is the sense, and that by it is denoted the abundance of the gifts or influences of the Spirit, and the entire subjection of the soul to those influences, and that immersion in water is a symbol of these things. In this view Dr. Carson is not peculiar.

" Neander in his history of the planting of the Church, says, that ' Submersion is a symbol of the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life.' Wahl, Schleusner, Rosenmuller, and Bloomfield, are also of opinion that the sense is, copiously to imbue with abun-

dant gifts of the Spirit. But beyond all doubt this view must be erroneous. Indeed it is very remarkable how full and how powerful the testimony of the Fathers is against this view. In Isa. iv, 4, it was predicted (as we have already seen) that the Messiah should purify, (*ekkatharizo*,) by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning. Here there can be no dispute as it regards the causative or active sense of *en*.

"This passage the Fathers refer to with great frequency, as conveying the same sense as the passage in question, 'He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit, and with fire.' Basil says, that both passages *plainly* foretell the same thing concerning Christ. Eusebius of Cesarea says, that both passages 'coincide in sense to a remarkable degree.' Origen, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, coincide in this view."

After giving the views of these Fathers, Pres. Beecher continues (pp. 313, 314,) "In addition to this, the antithesis requires it. John did not mean to set forth the abundance of water used by himself, as if water was scarce, and they thirsty. The idea is ludicrous. And yet, if the second member of the antithesis is designed, as Dr. Carson and others assert, to set forth the abundance of the gifts and influences of the Holy Spirit, the first member should set forth the abundance of water conferred by John. Thus John should be represented as saying, I indeed confer upon you, in your necessities, abundant supplies of water; I fill and imbue you copiously with it, but He shall confer upon you abundant supplies of Divine influences, and shall fill and imbue you largely with them. Besides, if the passage is thus rendered, the very pith and point of it is lost, that is, the contrast between an external purification, of no saving power, and one that is internal and effectual, produced by the omnipotent energy of the Divine Spirit. That this is the very pith and point of the passage,

is plain from the fact that Basil and Eusebius declare that to be baptized by the Holy Spirit and fire, is entirely equivalent to the expression in Isa. iv, 4, ‘He shall purify by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning,’ also from the fact that the Fathers see in the words ‘He shall purify and purge,’ (Mal. iii, 3,) a prediction of baptism by the Holy Spirit. Athanasius also expressly declares that to baptize by the Holy Ghost, is to purify, and he does not at all refer to the idea of abundant supplies of Divine influence.”

Hence, from this amount of evidence to support the conclusion before stated, that the Holy Spirit is a voluntary agent who purifies, and not an influence in which believers are immersed. The conclusion is clear and irrefragable.

1. “The purification effected by the Holy Spirit is of two kinds ; (1.) a deliverance from the guilt of sin, i. e. liability to be punished, and from a sense of guilt through the atonement; (2.) a purification from spiritual defilement.

“It is through the atonement that pardon is given ; and through the Holy Spirit conviction of sin is produced ; and by him also a sense of guilt is taken away in view of the atonement ; and in this sense he is said to cleanse from sin by the blood of Christ.

“This kind of purification may be called legal, as it relates to guilt, forgiveness, and atonement. The other kind of purification may be called moral, inasmuch as it removes the unholy and impure feelings and habits of the mind, and produces in their place those that are pure.” This is the sacrificial sense of baptism. See more §13.

This division corresponds also with the twofold object of the atonement ; (1.) to remove legal obstructions or cancel the claims of the law against the sinner ; and (2.) to provide a fountain of cleansing or purification for the removal of moral pollution. Hence the relation, as before observed, existing between water baptism and the atone-

ment of Christ. He has suffered and atoned for us, and we are baptized calling on the name of the Lord, and our forgiveness is announced accordingly. And the blood of Christ, applied by the Spirit of God, purges the polluted conscience from dead works to serve the living God. This is the washing of regeneration, and renewal of the Holy Ghost.

2. This baptism or purification of the Spirit, also includes the idea of a mystical union with Christ, indicated by a number of scripture passages as effected by baptism into Christ, or *into* the body of Christ. See §34. It is a change of state or condition, in a moral point of view. A translation from one state to another, as from a state of sin and condemnation, to a state of peace and pardon ; or from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God. It involves the ideas of deliverance from sin, security against sin, and assurance of ultimate and complete happiness. This vital change is well illustrated by the baptism of the Israelites *unto* (or *into*) Moses at the passage of the Red sea, (1 Cor. x, 2.) This text is in perfect keeping with all those passages indicating spiritual baptism, inasmuch as the same mode of speech is employed — eis ton Mosen — *into* Moses.

“Baptism here,” says Beecher (p. 112,) “denotes neither Christian baptism nor external baptism ; but a throwing back of the name of the antitype upon the type, from a regard to similar effects. Believers, by spiritual baptism, are delivered from Satan and united to Christ. The children of Israel were delivered from Pharaoh, and really united to Moses as a leader and Saviour, by the cloud and the sea. There was here *no external profession, but a real union to Moses* as a leader, effected by a separation and deliverance from Pharaoh: In all this Moses was a type of Christ, and, therefore, the name of the antitype is thrown back upon this transaction, and it is called a

baptism into Moses, but not into the name of Moses. On the same principle, i. e., regard to effects, spiritual baptism is called the antitype of the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark. For as the one actually saved Noah in the ark, so the other actually saves believers in Christ."

That the change here brought to view, is a real internal, sensible change, wrought by the Spirit of God, is abundantly evident, from the varied and pointed language of the sacred penmen upon the subject. All clearly expressive of putting off the former character, and putting on, and appearing in a new character, suited to the moral government of God, and the moral condition of man. It is called the "putting off the old man with his deeds"—"the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;" and "putting on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness"—"the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." It is also called "the putting on of Christ," with all the blessed consequences. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Compare Eph. iv, 22-24; Col. iii, 9-12; Gal. iii, 27, 28; and 1 Cor. xii, 13.

### § 39. AND THE EFFECTS OF SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

The legitimate *effects* of the baptism of the Spirit are threefold — they involve the ideas of a spiritual or moral death and burial, a quickening and resurrection to a new life; and a continued death to sin, or mortification of the appetites, answerable to the scripture doctrine of a progressive sanctification or growth in grace.

1. This baptism produces produces a *death to sin*. The

Apostle says, Rom. vii, 9, "I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died ;" "For I through the law, am *dead* to the law, that I might live unto God," Gal. ii, 19; "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become *dead* to the law by the body of Christ." Rom. vii, 4. All mankind, in a state of nature, are represented as dead in trespasses and in sins ; but here is a different death brought to view—a spiritual or moral death—a death, not in sin, but *to sin*. The sinner is *alive* to sin, but dead to God and holiness ; but the believer is *alive* to God and *dead* to sin. This moral death is produced or effected by spiritual baptism. Says the Apostle, Rom. vi, 3, 4, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, *were baptized into His death?* Therefore, we are buried with Him by *baptism into death* ;" and (Col. ii, 12) "*buried with Him in baptism.*"

This moral death, includes the idea of a crucifixion, a death to sin, and a burial with Christ. These changes which occurred with Christ naturally and externally, are analogous to what takes place with the believer spiritually and internally ; and thus supply the lively imagination of Paul with these metaphors, which are by an easy process of the mind, transferred to the believer. The believer is regarded as identified with Christ, and as having a fellowship with Him in his sufferings, death and burial ; and also in His resurrection and new spiritual life. Says Paul, Gal. ii, 20, "I am crucified with Christ ;" and Rom. vi, 6, "Our old man is crucified with Him." Crucifixion is a most painful, as well as a lingering death ; and every renewed soul can testify, from sore experience, to the death-struggle in his own bosom, when he crucified the "old man" and died to sin, "*that the body of sin might be destroyed* ; that henceforth he should not serve sin, but live unto God." Hence, the believer is enabled to com-

prehend that contradiction in terms, in which he is represented by the Apostle, as being both dead and alive at the same time. Col. iii, 3, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God ;" and "I am crucified with Christ ; nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Gal. ii, 20.

2. But another effect of spiritual baptism, is a *resurrection* to a new and hidden life. The idea of a spiritual resurrection is not confined to the New Testament, as we have already seen ; it occurs in Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones. It also occurs in Eph. i, 18-20 ; ii, 1-6, and Col. ii, 13, in which believers are represented as being quickened together with Christ — from their spiritually dead condition — and as raised up together with Him ; and as made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. And this is all ascribed to the agency of the Spirit — the power of God — the glory of the Father, etc., which He exercised in the resurrection of Christ. (See sec 37, 3.) And this resurrection is also produced by the baptism, and is a legitimate consequence. As we have already seen, the baptism is spiritual and internal, and so are the crucifixion, the death, and burial, and the resurrection ; and of course, the new life which ensues. "Therefore," says the Apostle, Rom. vi, 4, "we are buried with Him by baptism into death ; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father ; even so we should *walk in newness of life*," or in a new spiritual life. And again, Col. ii, 12, 13, "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein, also, ye are *raised with Him*, through the faith of the operation of God"— "and you hath He *quickened together with Him*." It is almost needless to remark here, that the agency employed in this resurrection — the power of God — the faith in that power, called the faith of the operation of God, and

the new life brought to view — all clearly involve the idea of a radical, thorough, internal change.

This view fully accords with a number of other scripture passages upon the subject, and possesses all the evidencing power of truth. The Apostle says, Gal. ii, 20, “I am crucified with Christ ; nevertheless I *live*, yet not I, but *Christ liveth in me* ; and the life which I now live in the flesh, *I live by the faith* of the Son of God ;” “Who His own self bear our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, *being dead to sins*, should *live unto righteousness*,” 1 Pet. ii, 24. “Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but *alive unto God* through our Lord Jesus Christ,” Rom. vi. 11. “For ye are *dead*, and your *life is hid with Christ* in God,” Gal. iii, 3. In all these texts, the believer readily recognizes that new and hidden life, which sweetly works by love, and he is constrained to ascribe it wholly to the “One Lord,” who suffered and died for him — the “one faith,” or system of truth believed and acted upon, and the “one baptism,” or regeneration, which purifies the heart, and unites the soul to God, Eph. iv, 5 ; and to join the Apostle in the language of exultation, Gal. vi, 14, “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *the world is crucified* unto me, and *I unto the world*.” “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection ;” “rooted and built up in Him, and stablished in the faith,” Romans vi, 5, and Col. ii, 7.

3. And finally, another result of spiritual baptism is, a *continued death* unto sin, and a *continued resurrection* unto a life of holiness. The class of texts which we shall adduce under this head, represents the believer as radically changed, as dead to sin and alive to God ; and as exercising a living faith, and all the powers of his renewed

soul, in making greater attainments in the divine life, or in reaching greater degrees of sanctification. Moreover, what is affirmed in these passages concerning this spiritual change, will not fully apply to what takes place at the moment of conversion, or to what precedes it, but measurably to the exercises of the renewed soul during this present life. What we have to say more under this head, we shall notice in three distinct points of view :

### 1. *Salvation from the Power and Love of Sin.*

The Apostle Peter (1 Peter iii, 21) speaking of a baptism which now *saves us*, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ ; which was prefigured by the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark, by water. And he affirms that it is “not the putting away the filth of the flesh,” by an outward washing, “but the answer of a good conscience towards God ;” that is, a conscience purged or purified, by the sprinkling of the “blood of Jesus Christ.” The salvation here brought to view, derives all its efficacy, from the death and resurrection of Christ, as applied to the conscience in spiritual baptism ; which rescues the believing soul from under the curse of the law, and unites and identifies it with Christ the living Head. Now, hear the exhortation of Peter addressed to such in the language of the next chapter, which meets a hearty response in the bosom of every new born soul. “Forasmuch then as Christ has suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind ; for he that *suffered* in the flesh hath *ceased* from sin ; that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.” 1 Peter iv, 1, 2, etc.

### 2. *Aspirations after Higher Attainments in the Divine Life.*

Says the Apostle Paul, Phil. iii, 8-11, “I count all

things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord — that I may win Christ and be found in Him — that I may *know Him*, and the *power* of His *resurrection*, and the *fellowship* of His *sufferings*, being made *conformable* unto his *death*; if by any means I might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead*.” Here, says Beecher, (p. 101,) “Paul desires to know fully and in a spiritual sense — that which corresponds by analogy to those natural changes in Christ — 1, sufferings ; 2, death ; 3, resurrection ; 4, experience of divine power ; and he shows how he aimed at the spiritual perfection involved in a perfect similitude to these natural events, *i. e.*, a perfect moral crucifixion, death, and resurrection — though he had not yet attained, and was not yet perfect. There is not the least allusion to his own *natural resurrection* here. That would take place, of course, and without any effort on his part ; and the law of analogy totally forbids such an interpretation.” And Paul, doubtless, realized the consummation of his highest wishes, when he could say, near to the close of life, “I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand — I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith. Henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day.”

3. In conclusion. The *attractions* of heaven grow stronger and stronger.

The Apostle says (Col. ii, 20): “If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world,” — “If ye then be *risen* with Christ, *seek those things* which are *above*, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affections *on things above*, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your *life is hid with Christ* in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then *shall ye also appear with him in glory*.” (Col. iii, 1-4, etc.)

The subject of spiritual baptism — or death to sin and

resurrection to a life of holiness — realizes an affinity to the family of God, that he is born from above, by the power of the resurrection, and bound for heaven — that his life is indeed hid with Christ in God. And he is the happy subject of a conscious assurance of his union with Christ and saving interest in his blood, and that when Christ who is our life shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation, then he also shall appear with him in glory. Not only with a soul raised and renewed into the Divine image, but also with an immortal body, fashioned like unto the glorious resurrection body of our blessed Redeemer — a child of the resurrection, and an heir of *immortality and eternal life.*

## SPIRITUAL BAPTISM.

---

### CHAPTER II.

#### THE INTERPRETATION OF ROM. vi, 3, 4, AND COL. i, 12

THE whole of this chapter is abridged from Pres. Beecher's able interpretation of these important passages. And in accommodating it to the comprehension of plain readers, I am persuaded that I have generally succeeded in preserving the perspicuity and force of the original ; and have omitted nothing which tends directly to the elucidation of these difficult texts. The interpretation extends from page 83 to 116 of Beecher on Baptism.

#### § 40. IMPORTANCE OF A CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF ROM. vi, 3, 4, AND COL. ii, 12.

The conclusion to which we have arrived by our previous inquiries is this: *Purification* is enjoined by a specific command, but no *particular mode* of purification is enjoined. Of course, any individual may be lawfully purified in the way that he prefers. No result can be more desirable than this, for none tends more directly to harmonize the Church. It combines the two fundamental requisites for union, which are, 1, to take from no church anything which it desires, as to its own mode of purification ; and 2, to authorize each church to regard the purification of others, though differing from its own, as valid.

Who, that loves the harmony of the Church, who, that regards the feelings and wishes of Christ, would not rejoice at an issue so auspicious? What can be more desirable than a union without sacrifice of principle, or loss of any valued practice? But this result secures all this; nay, more, it would give to our Baptist brethren, not only the full enjoyment of all they desire, without diminution or loss, but add to it the sweet persuasion, that on this point, all their Christian brethren are also right, and can, in like manner, enjoy the mode which they prefer. Thus all painful barriers to communion will at once be taken away, the middle wall of partition will fall, and all, in Christian love, will be united as one new man.

In proportion then to the desirableness of this event, is the importance of a radical investigation and correct interpretation of Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12; for next to the word baptizo, these have been, and still are, the most serious obstacles to such a result. As I have before stated, our Baptist brethren regard these passages as an inspired exposition of the mode of baptism. (See § 4.) Nor are they without authority for interpreting these texts as referring to the mode of the external rite. The opinions of the Fathers so far as I have examined, are entirely with them; and especially the influence of Chrysostom in the East, and of Augustine in the West, tended to give it currency everywhere. Besides, it is strongly sustained by the opinions of many modern critics. Of these it is enough to mention Luther, Jaspis, Knapp, Rosenmuller, Doddridge, and Barnes—none of them Baptists by profession.

Of course we need not wonder that our Baptist brethren feel strong, and express themselves with confidence, and even exultation, in speaking of these passages. Says Dr. Carson, page 144: "I value the evidence of these pas-

sages so highly, that I look on them as perfectly decisive. They contain God's own explanation of his own ordinance. And in this, I call upon my unlearned brethren to admire the Divine wisdom. They do not understand the original, and the adoption of the words *baptize* and *baptism* can teach them nothing. Translators, by adopting the Greek word, have contrived to hide the meaning from the unlearned. But the evidence of the passages in question cannot be hid, and it is obvious to the most unlearned. The Spirit of God has enabled them to judge for themselves in this matter. Whilst the learned are fighting about *baptizo*, and certain Greek prepositions, let the unlearned turn to Rom. vi, 4, and Col. ii, 12," etc. This may be taken as a fair specimen of the strength of feeling that pervades the whole body; and if so, it is plain that all hopes of union are fallacious, until the true interpretation of these passages is ascertained. Most cordially, therefore, do I unite with Dr. Carson in inviting, not the unlearned only, but all — learned and unlearned — to turn to Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12.

#### § 41. POINTS AT ISSUE — PRINCIPLES OF REASONING.

Let us first present in full these remarkable and important passages of the word of God, and then endeavor to ascertain upon what points the interpretation of them turns. They are as follows: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Rom. vi, 3, 4. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. ii, 12.

Upon these passages two distinct *questions* may be raised :

1. *Is the BAPTISM of the believer here spoken of, external?*
2. *Are the BURIAL and RESURRECTION of the believer here spoken of, external?*

I here assume the following positions or principles, the first of which has been already proved, and the second of which is so obviously true as to need no proof.

1. The philological question, as to the import of *baptizo*, *neither depends upon the interpretation of this passage, nor is affected by it.* Each stands upon its own ground, and must be decided by its own evidence. And if it were proved that external baptism, burial, and resurrection are here referred to, it would only prove, that under a command to purify, they did in fact purify by immersion. And we must still translate the passage, "We have been buried with him by *purification* into his death," — not by "*immersion*" into his death. For we have already shown that, as a religious term, *baptize* does not mean to immerse, but solely to purify. In other words, we could prove immersion, &c., only by the word *bury*, and not at all by the word *baptize*.

2. *As the baptism is, so is the burial.* That is, if the baptism is external, so is the burial ; and if internal, so is the burial. We are buried by the baptism spoken of,— we have been buried with Him by baptism, etc., Rom. vi, 4. And an external baptism cannot produce an internal burial, nor can an internal baptism produce an external burial.

#### § 42. POSITION TO BE PROVED.— SOURCES OF EVIDENCE.

We now proceed to consider the two questions above stated. In answering them, three positions have been taken :

1. The baptism into Christ is *external*, and of course, the burial and resurrection.

2. The baptism is external, but the burial and resurrection are internal.

3. The baptism, burial, resurrection, etc., are all internal, and the passage does not refer to the external rite at all, nor derive any of its language from it; but the language would have been just as it is, if the rite had been administered by sprinkling alone, or even if there had been no external rite.

The third is the position which I intend to maintain, and it is obviously the direct antagonist of the first, the usual position of the Baptists, and also of the Fathers and others. The second is an intermediate position, advocated by Wardlow, Prof. Stewart, and others, but, as I have indicated above, inconsistent with itself; because, if the baptism is external, so must be the burial and the resurrection. It is on this ground that Prof. Ripley reasons, and I think conclusively, against Prof. Stuart. "This opinion," (that the burial is internal,) he says, "seems effectually opposed by the circumstance that the burying is performed by *baptism, an external rite*, p. 58. And all who admit that the external rite is here spoken of, must, it seems to me, be inevitably driven to Prof. Ripley's ground. But, believing as I do, that the external rite is not meant, and that the external interpretation of this passage is not only false, but injurious to the cause of truth and holiness, I shall proceed to state the evidence which seems to me to overthrow the first position, and to establish the last. My leading arguments may be arranged under the four following heads :

1. Evidence from the course of the Apostle's argument, and the logical exigencies of the passages.

2. Evidence from the language employed, as to spiritual death, burial, resurrection, etc.

3. Evidence from the congruity of the interpretation, with the general system of truth.

4. Evidence from the moral tendencies and effects of each interpretation.

### § 43. THE COURSE OF THE ARGUMENTS, AND THE LOGICAL EXIGENCIES.

Let us then consider, 1, the course of the Apostle's argument, and 2, the logical exigencies, or demands, of Rom. vi, 3, 4. We shall consider Col. ii, 12, by itself. The argument involves three points :

1. An objection stated in the form of a question, verse 1 : "What then? shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" Does not the doctrine of the free forgiveness of the greatest sin, by the abounding grace of God through Christ, lead to this result? Or, to put it in the form of a positive objection, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by free grace, tends to relax the power of motives to holiness, and to encourage men to live in sin.

2. A reply, verse 2 : "God forbid. How shall we who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Here Paul speaks in the name of all who are really forgiven, and virtually asserts that all, who are in fact forgiven, are, of course, dead to sin, and cannot live any longer therein, implying, of necessity, that the system itself produces this effect on all who experience its true and genuine influence, and that it is necessary and universal. In brief, the objection is, Does not the system encourage men to sin? The answer is, No, it makes them dead to sin, so that they cannot live any longer in it.

3. A proof that the fact alleged is true, *i. e.* that the system does tend to holiness, with immense power, and not to sin, verses 3-11.

The question now at once arises, What is good and logical proof of such a point, *i. e.*, of the true and natu-

ral operation of a moral system on the human mind? In answering this, we shall perceive at once the logical exigencies, or demands, of the passage.

Can such proof then be found in external rites, solemn promises, and significant symbols? Or must we look for it in a clear statement of the internal, natural, and inevitable operation of the system, as a system, on the mind? As to the first, I need only ask, what system, be it good or bad, is destitute of significant rites and symbols, and of solemn confession and promises? Papists and Protestants, Arminians, Calvinists, Unitarians, Campbellites, Mormons — all have them; even the rite of immersion is common to some of the worst with some of the best. But in what case have these things given to any system a regenerating or sanctifying power sufficient to uproot and destroy the desperate depravity of the human heart? Is it not a well known fact, that the radical effects of all systems depend, not on external rites and solemn promises, but on principles. These are the internal and germinating power of every system, and just so far as these are adapted to act on the human mind, so is the system. And as a general fact, those who depend most on promises, professions, and external rites, as a means of subduing sin, have the least success.

In order, then, to make out a sound logical argument, it is necessary that Paul should exhibit the *internal* operation on the mind, of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins by faith, and prove that it does in fact cause all who come under its influence, to be dead to sin. *This, according to the internal mode of interpretation, he does; but according to the external mode, he does not.* The one states the actual and inward effects of the forgiveness of sins through faith. The other merely refers us to the influence of an external rite. That this is so let us now proceed to establish.

The fundamental points in the interpretation are four:

1. Ebaptisthemen is to be interpreted, *we have been purified* or *purged*, in the legal or sacrificial sense, to denote the actual purification or purgation of the conscience from guilt by the Spirit. This is the spiritual baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the designed influence of the system on the mind of a convicted sinner. Of this state of mind we have the following beautiful description from the pen of Cowper :

Sweet was the time when first I felt  
The Saviour's pardoning blood,  
*Applied to cleanse my soul from guilt,*  
And bring me home to God.

Thus, by this mode of translation, we pass at once, not to an external rite, but to the actual influence of the system on the mind.

2. Ebaptisthemen eis Christon, (we have been baptized into Christ,) is to be interpreted as indicating no external rite, but an actual union with Christ, by this spiritual purgation, or sense of the forgiveness of sins. This consciousness of forgiving love awakens corresponding love, and produces an entire union to Christ, and devotedness to him. “ Whom having not seen, ye love ; and in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of joy.” This is a spiritual baptism into Christ, involving a real and vital union to him.

3. As the baptism into Christ is thus internal and spiritual, so are the death, burial, and resurrection spoken of as produced by it ; and these are to be regarded as the genuine and universal effects of the system of forgiveness by faith in Christ.

4. These changes involve a crucifixion to sin, a death to it, a burial as it regards the old man, and a resurrection as it regards the new man, analogous to the natural

crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Thus the propositions of Paul may be briefly reduced to this : By forgiveness of sins we are truly and vitally united to Christ, and the inevitable effect of this union is to exterminate, radically and entirely, our old sinful character, and to produce a new one, pure and holy like his own.\* That these propositions, if true, do make a logical argument, none can deny. Thus,

*Objection.* The system of forgiveness of sins through faith in Christ tends to embolden men in sin.

*Reply.* It does not ; for all who are truly forgiven are dead to sin, and cannot live in it any longer. This is the natural and necessary consequence of the system.

*Proof.* All who are forgiven are united by it to Christ, and it is the inevitable consequence of this union to cause death unto sin, and life unto God. \* \* \*

What, therefore, the internal interpretation affirms, as it regards the natural influence of the system of forgiveness by faith in Christ, is an obvious and well known truth ; it is true concerning this system alone. The argument, then, is not only perfectly logical, but one of the highest importance and power. See the nature of spiritual baptism, § 38.

But what shall we say of the external interpretation ? How does, or how can an external rite prove that the system of forgiveness of sins through Christ produces death to sin ? The reply of the Fathers would have been logical if true. They held that Christ gave to the waters

\* This view of the spiritual import of Rom. iii, 4, and Col. ii, 11, 12, is not peculiar to Pedobaptists ; it was the view of Robinson the Baptist historian, and of the late Dr. Judson, missionary to India. Mr. Judson says of Col. ii, 11, 12 : "The Apostle is here speaking of *spiritual circumcision* and *spiritual baptism*. In spiritual baptism, or regeneration, believers are spiritually 'crucified with Christ,' die with him, are buried with him, and rise with him to 'newness of life,' and to new obedience." — *Encyc. Rel. Knowl. Art. Bap.*

a purging power ; it was holy water ; there was a mysterious energy to destroy sin, and to communicate the Holy Spirit. Alas for the religion of Christ ! for centuries long and dark this was almost the only view of the Church. This view, therefore, is not only to be rejected as false, but to be abhorred as unutterably pernicious.

We come then to all that remains to the moral influence of the solemnity of the baptismal promise and rite, as exhibited by Prof. Chase, and others ; or to the argument from its import, as stated by Dr. Carson. According to the first view, those who have been duly immersed are supposed to be thus addressed : " Reflect how solemn your professions and promises in the hour of baptism, and how significant the rite by which your duty was shadowed forth, and your relations to Christ presented to the mind. Did you not solemnly promise, when immersed, to die unto sin and to live unto God ? And as you sank into a watery grave, and came forth once more to the vital air, did you not solemnly show forth your duty to die unto sin, and rise to a new and holy life, and also the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, by which your salvation was procured."

\* \* \* In fidelity to God, I am constrained to ask : What does all this amount to, unless it be to throw the main and peculiar reforming power of the Gospel, upon the influence to be exerted by the solemnities of one external rite ? And is it come to this ? Is this all the answer that even an Apostle can give to an objection against the Gospel, so deep, so fundamental ? Are solemn promises and the moral power of one rite, the vital and essential elements of the reforming power of the Gospel ? \* \* \*

But Dr. Carson and others will say : That is not our view. We hold that Paul uses the symbolical import of baptism, to prove that believers are in fact dead to sin.

To this I reply: It does not help the case; for any external rite, in such a course of argument, cannot prove any such thing. How can the operation of any system on the mind be proved, except by looking directly at the mind itself, and considering the effect of the system on it?

\* \* \* The obvious fact is, that all allusion to an external rite is here out of place. It destroys the train of reasoning, perplexes and confuses the mind, and causes a deep and painful feeling of the entire absence of logical proof. Hence we need not wonder, that logical minds have felt this. Mr. Barnes says openly, that there is no *reasoning* here, but mere popular appeal; and truly, according to the external mode of interpretation, there is none. But is this the place for popular appeal? If ever an objection deserved a thorough and logical reply, this is the one. Moreover, up to this point we have had reasoning, cogent and condensed. Why suppose a break in the chain here? Above all other places, this ought to be strictly logical, and unanswerably strong; and so indeed it is. There is no break, there is no flaw; there is no relying on popular appeal; there is no magnifying of the power of promises, professions, and external rites. But there is a close logical and unanswerable argument, from the necessary operation of the gospel on the human mind. But this will become still more evident, when we proceed to consider the requisitions of the terms employed, as to spiritual crucifixion, death, burial, etc.

#### § 44. THE MODE OF SPEECH EMPLOYED, AS TO SPIRITUAL DEATH, BURIAL, ETC.

We have great reason for gratitude, that the mode of speech, used in these disputed passages, is not limited to them, but exists in numerous other places, where it can be the subject of no fair dispute. The mode of speech in question, is not accidental, without rules, and obscure,

but based in principles clear, certain, and consistent. It is found chiefly in the writings of Paul, but it clearly occurs in those of Peter. Its principles are these :

1. The spiritual crucifixion, towards which the forgiveness of sins tends, as already shown, is a work involving great and intense pain, and to induce a man to summon all his resolution and energy to do it thoroughly, powerful motives are needed.

2. Such is the nature of man, that the most powerful motives, by which he can be influenced, must be derived from the following sources : (1.) Affecting examples of fortitude and suffering. (2.) Infinite blessings received through a suffering friend. (3.) The deep interest of that friend in our suffering for him. The loss of fortitude to endure suffering for the general good, and a love of indolence and ease, are the universal characteristics of our depraved nature, and are the hardest of all to be overcome. But if the idea can be fully thrown into the mind, and kept daily before it, that our highest benefactor himself *suffered with infinite fortitude*, and not only so, but that he thus suffered *for us*, and not only so, that he infinitely and ardently desires *to form the same traits in us*, and rejoices to see us, from love to him, crucify the spirit of indolence, indulgence, and ease, and learn to rejoice in a life of fortitude and suffering for the good of others, like his own, then motives are concentrated and accumulated, the power of which no man can resist.

3. It is the design of this mode of speech to combine all these varied motives in one condensed appeal. The mode adopted in this, Christ and the believer are represented as mutually interested in each other, and both are *suffering for*, and *with*, the other. The part in each, that suffers, is called by the same name,—the flesh. But in the one case, it is external and material, the body of Christ. In the other, it is internal and spiritual — the

body of sin, the old man. As each is spoken of as having a body, so each body is represented as composed of members; in the one case, external and material as before, in the other case, internal and spiritual, i. e., various and deep-rooted habits of sin, to be eradicated by a process as painful as to cut off a right hand or foot, or to pluck out a right eye. Thus we have the body of sin, and its members, the old man and his members, which are the same as the flesh, with its affections and lusts.

All these then are spoken of as to be crucified, eradicated, and destroyed; but as the work is excessively painful, and flesh and blood shrink from its thorough execution, the example of Christ, as enduring intense pain in His flesh, i. e., His body and members, in the agonies of crucifixion for us, is presented as an example for us to imitate, in our moral crucifixion for Him. This entire train of thought is fully set forth in 1 Peter iv, 1: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath *suffered for us* in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind, (i. e. summon all your energy to suffer for Him in the flesh;) *for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin.*" In other words, he who hath crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof, hath ceased from sin. Only the internal sense is here possible; for crucifying the flesh, in this sense, does destroy sin; bodily suffering does not. The final result is then stated, "that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh (i. e. in the body, or in this world,) to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." Thus the appeal is thorough and complete. And how great is its power. \* \* \*

This mode of speech is carried out in other parts of scripture, in great minuteness of detail, but always on this principle, that the sufferings of Christ are supposed to be fully before the mind, as an object of daily meditation and imitation, and that whatever took place naturally in connexion with the sufferings of Christ, has something

to correspond with it spiritually, in its connection with the sufferings of believers. Thus :

## CHRIST.

## THE BELIEVER.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Christ suffered naturally.  | 1. The believer suffers spiritually.   |
| 2. Christ in His flesh, i. e., body natural.                                 | 2. The believer in his flesh, i. e., body of sin.  |
| 3. The members of Christ's body were crucified.                              | 3. The members of the body of sin are to be crucified.   |
| 4. Christ's body died entirely.<br>All natural life was totally extinct.     | 4. The body of sin, the old man, the flesh, is to be entirely destroyed.                         |
| 5. Christ's natural death was for sin.                                       | 5. The believer's spiritual death is to sin.   |
| 6. Christ was buried naturally, and became invisible in the grave.           | 6. The believer is to be buried spiritually, and to become invisible in his old character.       |
| 7. Christ rose naturally, and appeared in new external glory.                | 7. The believer is to rise spiritually, and appear in a new, holy, glorious spiritual character. |
| 8. It was the mighty natural power of God that raised Christ.                | 8. It is the mighty power of God through faith that raises the believer.                         |
| 9. Christ after His resurrection sat down in heavenly places bodily.         | 9. Believers sit down by faith in heavenly places, after their resurrection.                     |
| 10. Christ dies naturally no more ;<br>death hath no more dominion over Him. | 10. Believers die in sin no more ;<br>death spiritual hath no more dominion over them.           |

This process is sometimes stated antithetically, and in separate parts, but it is also expressed in abbreviated form of speech, formed by compounding the word denoting the action with sin,\* (with,) in all which cases is implied. I do or suffer that spiritually, which Christ did or suffered naturally. So believers are said to suffer, be crucified, die, be buried, be restored to life, be raised, sit in heavenly places, and live forever *with Christ*, i. e., spiritually, as in His case naturally.

The reason of this is to be found in two facts :

\* For example, sumpascho, (to suffer together with,) surtauroo (to crucify together with,) sunapothnesko, (to die together with,) sunthapto, (to bury together with,) suzoopoieo, (to quicken together with,) sunegairo, (to raise together with,) sugkathizo, (to sit down with,) etc.

1. Christ suffered, died, etc., naturally, in order to secure, not only forgiveness, but also these very spiritual changes in us, and it is the power of His example and love which, in fact, produces them. As Christ, therefore, had all these things in view, when He suffered, and as His sufferings rendered them sure, the spiritual sufferings of believers are looked on as virtually included in the natural sufferings of Christ: their death *to sin* in His *for it*—their spiritual burial, resurrection, and eternal life, in His natural burial, resurrection, and eternal life. For, surely one series did involve and render certain the other; and so when one came to pass *actually*, the other did virtually.

2. The ardent love to Christ which ever glowed in the breast of Paul, led him to devise this mode of speech, as the best adapted to express his unutterable affection for his Saviour, his all-absorbing admiration of his character, and his infinite and intense desire to be in all things one with Him. Hence the least remains of sin he regarded as excluding him from a perfect experimental and sympathetic knowledge of the character of Christ; and, by self-crucifixion, to reach this point of a perfect experimental sympathy in the absolute perfection of a suffering Saviour, was the summit of all his desires. Hear him as he exclaims, “I count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, my Lord, that I may know Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death.” And again: I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” And again: “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.” The various forms of this mode of speech, in all its range, are not the mere offspring of a luxuriant poetic imagination. They are the sacred, elevated, spiritual language of unutterable love,

the full power and beauty of which no eye can see, or heart feel, that has never felt the emotion from which it sprang. And sad was that day for the primitive church, when her heart ceased to beat responsive to that of Paul and darkness fell upon the spiritual import of his sacred words.

To illustrate these principles by quotations in detail, would exceed my limits. I shall only refer to the following passages of scripture, on which they are based, and which, in order to see the whole truth upon the subject, ought to be carefully examined.

In Eph. i, 19–23, and ii, 1–7, natural death, resurrection, etc., in Christ, are viewed analogically with death in sin, resurrection from sin, etc., in believers; and the power of God, raising Christians by faith, is compared to His natural power in raising Christ, and is said to be analogical to it. In Phil. iii, 10–21, Paul desires to know fully, and in a spiritual sense, that which corresponds by analogy to these natural changes in Christ,—1, suffering; 2, death; 3, resurrection; 4, experience of divine power. There is not the least allusion to his own *natural resurrection*, here the law of analogy totally forbids it. See sec. 39, 3, (2.) In Col. ii, 20, and iii, 1–4, we have, 1, *death* to the world with Christ; 2, a *resurrection* with Christ, and a sympathy with the things where Christ is, producing an internal and hidden life in him. Both of these changes in the believer are internal and spiritual, and in Christ external.

See also Gal. vi, 14; 1 Peter iv, 1, 2; Gal. ii, 19, 20; Col. iii, 5–14; Gal. v, 24. To these add Rom. vi, 1–13; and Col. ii, 11–13. Some of these have been referred to before, and the last two contain the passage in dispute; but I refer to them now, in order to present the scripture evidence in a single group. One thing more deserves our notice in this place. Two spiritual states are sometimes used as analogical to the death of Christ,—one *death in*

*sin*, as in Eph. ii, 1–7, and Col. ii, 11–13, the other, *death to sin* by moral crucifixion, as in Rom. vi, 1–13, and Phil. iii, 10–21. But in no case is the fundamental law of the analogy disregarded, i. e., that the states or changes in believers are spiritual and internal, those of Christ natural and external. In the sense of death in sin, moreover, they are never said to be dead with Christ; for, to secure such a death in them, He did not aim; but their death in sin is merely spoken of as calling for the exercise of the mighty power of God to raise them up, just as Christ's material death demanded almighty natural power in order to raise Him up.

The inferences which I draw from this exhibition of the mode of speech employed, are these:

1. The general law of analogy demands the internal sense throughout the whole of Rom. vi, 1–13, and Col. ii, 11–13. Look at the preceding columns of parallel analogies. Of these all but six and seven are undeniably internal and spiritual on one side, and external and natural on the other. By what law can eight out of ten, in a connected series, be internal and spiritual, and the other two external and physical?

2. Of these two, one—resurrection—is clearly proved, in the analogous passages, to be used in a spiritual sense. See Eph. ii, 5, 6, and Col. iii, 1. Does not the language employed then demand that sense here?

3. The resurrection in Col. ii, 11–13, is proved by internal evidence, to be spiritual; for it is *by faith*. Compare this now with precisely the same idea in Eph. i, 18–20, and ii, 4–6, Phil. iii, 10, 11, Col. iii, 1; and who can doubt? So in keeping believers, God exercises his mighty power *through faith*, 1 Pet. i, 5: "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." So in Col. ii, 12: "Ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God;" "ye were raised with him, by that faith, through which the power of God exerts

itself." Of course, if the resurrection is spiritual, so is the burial.

4. In the phrase, thanaton autou (his death) in Rom. vi, 3, the law of analogy requires autou (his) to be regarded as the genitive of similitude, i. e. a death like his, or analogical to it. This use of the genitive is exceedingly common; as in Jude 11, the way of Cain, the error of Balaam, and the gainsaying of Core, mean a way, error, and gainsaying, like that of Cain, Balaam, and Core. But to put it beyond all doubt, in verse 5 it is expressed in full — to homoiomati tou thanatou autou "the likeness of his death," i. e. a spiritual death, like his natural death.

5. Finally, the mode of speech, as it regards both spiritual baptism, and spiritual crucifixion and death, authorizes and requires us thus to interpret Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12.

Know ye not that so many of us, as have been purified into Christ, (i. e. truly united to Christ by the forgiveness of sins,) have been, by the forgiveness of sins, subjected to a spiritual death, like his natural death? Therefore as he was naturally buried, so are we spiritually buried by that forgiveness of sins, which subjected us to a spiritual death. That, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Rom. vi, 3, 4. As he was buried naturally, so were ye spiritually buried in the forgiveness of your sins, in which ye also rose spiritually as he did naturally, by that faith through which is exerted the power of that God, who raised him from the dead. Col. ii, 12. From the whole context, nothing can be more certain than the spiritual sense of this passage. We have, in verse 11, internal circumcision, and putting off the body of the flesh; in verse 12, a resurrection by faith; in verse 13, an internal death in sin, and an internal restoration to life. Who then can have the

least ground for calling the burial an external burial? So Rom. vi, 6, Paul expressly states that all that he has said of the death of the believer is to be understood of the death of the old man, and the destruction of the body of sin. But of course the burial and resurrection are as the death.

#### § 45. THE CONGRUITY OF THE INTERPRETATION WITH THE GENERAL SYSTEM OF TRUTH.

The system of truth is but one. Hence all truth is consistent with itself; and the more we investigate its minute relations, the more are we impressed with a conviction of its universal harmony. It is this perception of congruity in ten thousand minute particulars, which produces what we call a sense or feeling of verisimilitude. And as the operations of the mind are often so rapid as to elude analysis, it gives rise to what may be called a presentiment of truth, even before investigation. Nor is this to be despised. In any mind familiar with the great outlines of truth, such rapid perceptions of the agreement or disagreement of a given view with those great outlines, have a real and logical basis, as investigation seldom fails to show. But when investigation has taken place, they can be stated and exhibited in their true relations. Some of the incongruities of the external system of interpretation with the existing system of truth, I shall proceed to state:

1. It is incongruous to take so much notice of one external institution, and to say nothing of the rest.
2. It is incongruous, if only one is taken, to notice one which is less adapted to exert a great moral influence, and not to notice one more adapted.
3. It is incongruous for Paul to make so much of any external rite, and especially of this.
4. It is still more incongruous for Jesus Christ to do the same.

5. It is incongruous to establish one institution to commemorate the death of Christ, and then intrude on its province by another established for a different end.

1. As has been stated, the external interpretation rests the reforming power of the gospel, in a great degree, on the influences of profession and promises connected with an external rite, or on its influence in presenting truth to the mind. And are there no other institutions that have the same external power? Are there no solemn vows around the Lord's table, and no intensely affecting truths as to the death of Christ, inculcated by it? Does the Sabbath declare nothing of a heavenly rest, nor bid man to die to the world? Has the ministry and the preached word no reforming power? Why say so much of the "holy tendency" of immersion, and omit all these?

2. But if any one of these was to be selected, why choose that one which occurs but once in the life of a believer, and omit the oft-recurring influence of the Lord's Supper, and the solemn promises, renewed with increasing fervency, from year to year, till death closes the scene? Why say so much of the weaker, and yet wholly omit the stronger moral power? Is there indeed in this one rite a secret mystic influence, as the Fathers thought, operating with immense power, breaking down and destroying all sin, actual and original, at one blow? If not, and if it stands solely on the ground of moral influence, in impressing truth by symbols on the mind, then the selection of this, and the omission of the Lord's Supper are truly incongruous.

3. But if we could expect such an effort to magnify an external rite from any one, we should least of all expect it from Paul, who regarded it, in comparison with the gospel, as of so little weight, that he thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians, but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, and affirmed that God sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel;

and who gloried in nothing, save in the cross of Christ. Is it possible that this same Paul has, in another place, attempted to refute a fundamental objection to this same gospel, by magnifying the influence of this same external rite? What! at one time ascribe to it in some way such prodigious power to eradicate sin, and thank God that he did not administer it, and declares that he was not sent to do it!

4. Turn now to Christ, and hear him (Matt. xii, 7) rebuke the rigid construers of external observances, by the reproof: “If ye had known what that meaneth, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.” Again: when Peter desired a more complete washing than the rest of the Disciples, (John xiii, 10,) hear him declare that, to indicate complete purification, a washing of the feet is enough. And can we believe that this same Jesus inspired his beloved Paul to declare that purification cannot be acceptably signified in more than one way, and that one, immersion of the whole body?

5. Finally, the Lord’s Supper was established to show forth the Lord’s atoning death until he should come. Baptism indicates the actual purgation of the heart and conscience from sin, when the atonement is applied by the Holy Spirit. One indicates how redemption was procured; the other, how it is applied. One commemo- rates atonement by Christ; the other, regeneration by the Holy Spirit. But the external interpretation makes baptism a commemoration of three things: 1, the natural death and resurrection of Christ; 2, the spiritual death and resurrection of the believer; and 3, the natural resur- rection of the believer. Carson, page 232. This is incongruous indeed. It is a manifest intrusion into the province of the Lord’s Supper, and that without the least reason; and it nearly loses in ideas of death and resurrec- tion, all reference to purity. In truth, it seems to im-

merse, and almost to bury out of sight, the main idea of the rite, and to bring vividly before the mind the fundamental ideas of another rite ; so much so, that, in reading Prof. Chase's sermon on the design of baptism, one can hardly avoid feeling that it is even more a discourse on the design of the Lord's Supper, than a discourse on the design of that rite, which was peculiarly ordained to show forth the work of the Holy Ghost. Moreover, so far as it relates to purity, it is not the direct figure of the reality, but only the figure of a figure of the reality. *Purification* is the reality. But immersion, the Baptists all affirm, is the figure of *death*. But death is only the figure of the destruction of the old man, in which purification actually consists. But of purification it is no figure.

Such, then, are the inconsistencies and incongruities, which attend all the efforts to force an external sense on the baptism and burial spoken of in these passages. But assign to them the internal and spiritual sense, and all is consistent and clear. For it rests the reforming power of the gospel on no external rite, and intrudes on none. Nor does it at all disagree with the known character and feelings of Christ, or of Paul, but perfectly agrees with both ; for it directs us at once to the internal power of a spiritual purgation of the soul, by the Holy Ghost, to unite to Christ, and thus destroy the body of sin. And it presents distinctly and fully to the mind, that in which Paul was wont most to glory — the cross of Christ, and the energy of the gospel as the power of God to salvation, to every one that believeth.

#### § 46. THE MORAL TENDENCIES AND EFFECT OF EACH MODE OF INTERPRETATION.

The principles of this argument are plain. They are these :— All truth in its permanent influences, tends to holiness ; all error, to sin. Therefore, if we can show, *a priori*, that tendency to sin, in any view, or prove by

an appeal to facts that it has resulted in sin, we are authorized to draw the conclusion, that the view is false. Nevertheless, in this mode of reasoning, great care is needed not to confound mere accidental sequences with real and genuine effects. To guard against this, note the following facts :

1. Self crucifixion is, of all things, most painful. From all suffering men naturally shrink ; but much more from the pain and humiliation attendant on subduing sin, than from any other. Hence, to spare the old man, pilgrimages, fastings, flagellations, bodily sufferings of all kinds, and even death itself, are willingly endured.

2. Hence, in all ages a universal propensity to avoid the real and internal crucifixion of the old man, by a reliance on external forms of mysterious operations, or on an authorized ministry, or a primitive church, or solemn ceremonies, rather than on the simple and sure crucifixion of the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof.

3. The most powerful system, by which the Devil ever corrupted and destroyed the gospel of Christ, even the great mystery of iniquity, has its foundation in a skillful use of this tendency of the human heart. It is a system expressly designed to exclude spiritual crucifixion, that is, to exclude real holiness, and to replace it by a religion of ceremonies and forms.

4. The external interpretation tends naturally to that very view, for its obvious sense is to make external baptism the great destroyer of sin, and the great defense of the church against it.

5. By the Fathers, and even by Augustine, it was practically so regarded. He did not; indeed, exclude the Holy Spirit, but regarded the water, when consecrated, as involving, in some mysterious way, His presence ; and though he threw out cautions against the grosser forms of baptismal regeneration, yet, the practical influence of his

urgent appeals to sinners, to come to the baptismal pool, and wash away all their sins, or bury the old man, etc. etc., could not possibly have but one result. Baptism became practically the great thing ; and on it, eternal life or eternal death seemed to hang. And in all this mournful process, the external interpretation of these texts is almost the great moving power of the whole. It is not wise to give any one cause exclusive power in forming the Papal system, but I hesitate not to say, that no one cause did more than *baptismal regeneration* ; and no one cause did more to develop and mature that doctrine, than the external interpretation of these texts. Of this fact, pages of proof are at hand, and, if any one desires, can easily be produced. But, to those who have examined enough to judge, no proof, I think, can be needed.

6. No modern corrections or limitations of the patristic interpretation of these passages, have been able to neutralize or destroy the injurious tendency of the external views ; nor can it be done, so long as the great fact remains, that in an argument designed unanswerably to prove the sanctifying power of the gospel, an external rite comes when the internal energy of truth and the Holy Spirit ought to come. The external rite, if admitted at all with such a view, wrests and distorts the great outlines of the whole picture. It is not the glorious gospel that fills the mind, as held by all real Christians, but the peculiar solemnity, fitness, and significance of the form of immersion, or else the solemn promises made when immersed. And on a mind adverse to self crucifixion, and tending to self complacency and censoriousness, what must be the moral effect of such appeals as these : “ Yes, my brethren, we have been truly baptized, we have been *immersed*, and now the world looks to us for a proof of its sanctifying power ? ” Let it be granted that these things are not always said in pride, but often in deep and

humble sincerity. But what art can extract the venom they are adapted to infuse, or prevent the inevitable tendency to magnify certain forms, and to freeze the heart of Christian love to all who are without the range of those forms? In multitudes of noble spirits, I rejoice to record it, the last effect is not produced. But it is to be ascribed to other and powerful counteracting causes, whilst, when no such counteracting causes exist, the venom rages unchecked; and we are not obscurely told that it is, at least, uncertain, whether a person unimmersed, can ever enter the kingdom of God; and immersion, as of old, practically usurps the place of regeneration. Among the evangelical Baptists this, indeed, is not true; other causes prevent. But there have long been others who equal or even exceed them in their zeal for immersion, and even the Mormonites are now to be added to the list. If there is a real sanctifying power in this view, why are such multitudes of men, in all parts of our land, so zealous for it, who yet give no signs of crucifying the flesh with the affection and lusts thereof? The fact cannot be denied. Why is it so? Is it not because it presents, *as a cross to be taken up, a mere external rite*, and promises in some way by the mysterious operation of a form, to enable them to escape the self crucifixion they so much dread? And can holy men, men of prayer, sustain that very mode of interpretation on which it all rests, and not, whether they will or no, confirm such men in their views? Let all who are truly holy cut loose from this view, and soon the unholy will sink it by their own moral gravitation, and it will disappear.

On the other hand, the internal interpretation directs the attention of Christians directly to the interior, central, and fundamental work of self crucifixion, under the influence of forgiving love, and declares that true and real forgiveness of sin, always indicates itself by the

destruction of the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof, and stimulates and aids Christians, in the highest degree, by example, and gratitude, and sympathy between the believer and Christ.

It is no small loss then to the Christian world not only to lose the whole power of these passages for good, but even to have them perverted for evil, or else so obscured in the smoke of controversy, that they produce almost no effect, except to awaken in the mind an anxiety to know whether they do mean immersion or not. Let them be redeemed from all perversion and controversy, and let them utter in clear tones, the full heart of Paul, and they will arouse the whole church to the earnest pursuit of eminent holiness as with a trumpet call.

#### § 47. OBJECTIONS FROM AUTHORITY CONSIDERED.

The influence of authority, with many minds, is great ; and I should not be surprised if some should try to urge it in the present case, in view of opinions so numerous and respectable against this result. To this with all deference I would make the following reply :

1. In a radical discussion of the question, *Are the majority right?* an appeal to names is totally illogical. This is manifestly a case of the kind.

2. In some cases, numbers are a presumptive argument of error, and not of truth ; i. e. in the case of old errors, long established, and never thoroughly re-investigated.

3. That this is a case of the kind, one striking proof will clearly show ; — that every argument for the external sense, which I have found after extended search, has rested entirely on an obvious, yet fundamental mistake, (*or begging the question.*) I refer to the fact that in every case it has been assumed, without proof, or even an effort at proof, that the baptism spoken of is external,— just as if there were no such idea, in the word of God, as internal

baptism, or as if it were of no importance, and, therefore, it is always, *a priori* probable that whenever the word is used, the external rite is meant,— so probable that it may always be assumed without proof. Look now at the works of Prof. Chase, Dr. Carson, and Prof. Ripley, so often alluded to, and you find not even an effort to prove, philologically, that the baptism is external. It is always assumed. And yet, as all know, this is a fundamental point in the discussion.

What then are the facts as they present themselves in the New Testament? \* \* \* (See § 34.)

If these facts are so, where is the *a priori* improbability that internal baptism is meant in Rom. vi, 3, which all advocates of the external sense have assumed ? The fact is that the improbability, from the very form of language, is altogether against external baptism ; and all, who assume it, not only do so without proof, but without the possibility of proof, and against clear proof to the contrary.

No more striking instance can be given of the influence of a technical and external use of a word, without any reference to its spiritual signification, to turn away the mind from the true sense of the word of God. For in Eph. iv, 5, 6, as well as in Rom. vi, 3, and 1 Cor. xii, 13, and Gal. iii, 27, the same cause has entirely hid the true and spiritual sense, and put an external rite where the whole context demands the work of the Holy Spirit. One Lord,—even Jesus Christ who made atonement,—one faith, or glorious system of truth to be believed, and one regeneration — the glorious result of the application of that truth by the Holy Spirit ! How incongruous to place an external rite on such relations, and especially, so to exalt external *baptism*, and to say nothing of the Lord's Supper !

Through the same external, formal habit of mind, the beautiful and spiritual sense of Eph. v, 26, has been lost,

though the washing is expressly declared to be by the word of God; and the spiritual sense of water is overlooked, though God has expressly used it as a symbol of truth: "I will sprinkle *clean water* upon you, and ye shall be clean."

So also the spiritual sense of Titus iii, 5, is drowned beneath the flood of external baptismal regeneration, though the language is exactly adapted to express the beginning and progress of spiritual life, or regeneration and sanctification—"the washing of regeneration" denoting the first, and "renewing of the Holy Ghost" the progressive sanctification, caused by abundant effusions of the Holy Spirit.

Finally, not only is it true that external baptism is not meant in Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, but it is also true that there is no reason to think that any part of the language is taken from that rite. For,

1. Even had there been no external rite, but internal baptism only, the force of the analogy would have called for the use of burial in both of these passages. In speaking of the spiritual crucifixion, death, and resurrection of the believer, how could Paul help inserting burial?

2. The real origin of the language is obvious, *Christ was buried in fact*, as well as crucified, and the same series of events that furnished to Paul all the rest of his figures, would naturally furnish this.

3. The genius and habits of Paul's mind demand this origin; for it was not external baptism that was daily before his mind, but the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ.

4. The supposed connection or similitude between the word baptizo and burial, does not exist, for baptizo means to purify, and therefore, would not suggest the idea of burial. Such, then, is the proof of the position originally stated, that the *baptism, burial, resurrection*, etc., spoken of in Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, are all *internal*, and that the passage does not refer to the external rite at all, nor derive any of its language from it; but that the language would have been just as it is, if the rite had been administered by sprinkling alone, or even if there had been no external rite whatever.

## § 48. APPOSTOLIC PRACTICE CONSIDERED.

After what has been said, but few words are needed on this point. It is plain,

1. That to us it is of very little consequence, what their practice was ; for the command was only to purify, and God attaches no importance to any one mode rather than another.

2. It is not possible decisively to prove the mode used by the Apostles ; for if going to rivers, going down to the water and up from it, etc., create a presumption in favor of immersion, so does the baptism of three thousand on the day of Pentecost, in a city where water was scarce, and of the jailor in a prison, create a presumption in favor of sprinkling. And if a possibility of immersion can be shown in the latter cases, so can a possibility of sprinkling or pouring be shown in the former.

3. The command being to purify, and the facts being as stated, the decided probability is that either sprinkling, pouring, or immersion was allowed, and Christian liberty was everywhere enjoyed.

4. A tendency to formalism led to a misinterpretation of Paul in Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, and this gave the ascendancy to immersion, which increased, as before stated, till it became general, though it was not insisted on as absolutely essential on philological grounds.

5. Various causes, even in the Roman Catholic Church, at length produced a relaxation of this excessive rigor of practice. And most Protestants at the Reformation took the same ground. But,

6. A mistake in philology, after the Reformation, introduced a practice stricter and more severe than even that of the Fathers, and which reprobates Christian liberty on this subject, as a corruption of the word of God ; because various causes induced even the Roman Catholic Church to relax a little of the excessive strictness of antiquity. I know that all that comes from the Roman Catholic Church is *a priori* suspicious. But bad as that Church is, no one can deny that there is some truth there. The view I have advanced, I hold, not on her authority, but on its own merits. And I will not reject or deny a truth, even if it is found in a corrupt church.

## § 49. THE FINAL RESULT.

It appears, then, that the whole subject turns on three points : 1, the import of baptizo ; 2, the significance of the rite ; 3, early practice. On each, the argument in favor of immersion rests on *begging the question*. 1. It is assumed as improbable that baptizo can mean *purify*, without regard to mode, if it also means, in other cases, *immerse*. The falsehood of this assumption has been shown, the existence of an opposite probability proved, and the meaning *purify* clearly established by facts. 2. The improbability of *internal* baptism in Rom. vi, 3, 4, and Col. ii, 12, has been assumed, and external baptism has also been assumed without proof. It has been shown that the external sense, and not the internal sense, is improbable, and that against the external sense there is decisive proof. It has also been assumed that the practice of immersion by the Fathers and others, is proof of their philology, and that, therefore, they must have regarded the command to baptize as a command to immerse. The falsehood of this assumption has also been shown. The result of the whole is, that as to the *mode of purification* we may enjoy Christian liberty ; and that immeasurable evils attend the operation of those principles, by which many are now endeavoring to bring the Church upon exclusive ground. There is no objection to immersion, *merely as one mode of purification*, to all who desire it. But to immersion as the *divinely ordained and only mode*, there are objections deep and radical. We cannot produce unity by sanctioning a false principle ; our Baptist brethren can, by coming to the ground of Christian liberty. The conclusion, then, to which I would kindly, humbly, affectionately, yet decidedly come is this : "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

The whole argument is now closed. I intend, however, to add another part to the work,—should my life be spared a little longer, to embrace the scripture warrant for the membership and baptism of infants.